Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
presented by

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

LAUSANNE 1927

A Group of the Delegates

LAUSANNE 1927

AN INTERPRETATION OF THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER HELD AT LAUSANNE AUGUST 3-21, 1927

BY

EDWARD S. WOODS, M.A.

HON. CANON OF CANTERBURY

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

HIS GRACE

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

NEW YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

1927

LIBRARY
CENTRAL BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66102

First Published December 1927

Made and Printed in Great Britain
by Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh

PREFACE

The explanation of this book lies in the fact that the Continuation Committee of the Faith and Order Conference felt it desirable that there should be, in addition to the Official Report of the Conference,[1] a shorter and less formal account of it, calculated to interest Church people generally; and the Committee did me the honour of asking me to write this smaller volume. To this request I acceded, not because I regard myself as fitted to undertake so important a task, but because I believe so whole-heartedly in the cause of Reunion that I gladly embrace any opportunity to render service to that cause. I am only too conscious that the work might have been done better, and perhaps would have been done better, had there been for the doing of it ample time and a completely free mind. In fact, except for a holiday fortnight immediately after the Conference, the whole book has been written amid the pressing duties and engrossing tasks inseparable from the care of a large parish.

The Continuation Committee, in commissioning me to write the book, gave me a completely free hand in carrying out the task, so that the book is not an "official" interpretation of the Conference,

[1] Published by the Student Christian Movement: *Faith and Order*, price 10s. 6d.

59159

nor does any responsibility rest on the Committee for opinions set forth in these pages. On the other hand, I dare to hope that many who were at Lausanne—and my fellowship with them there I hold as a very precious memory—will recognize in this volume a substantially true record of a really great Conference. And I entertain the further hope that this account of Lausanne may come into the hands of a good many Church people, Anglican and Free Church, and through its story of a notable work of the Spirit, may stir them to fresh thought and action in this truly urgent matter of Christian unity. In order that the book might not end without any suggestion as to what might be done for the Reunion cause *from below*, so to speak, I have in the last chapter been bold enough to indicate the kind of line along which I find my own thoughts and hopes moving. But I trust that this expression of personal opinion will not in any way distract attention from what I believe to be the miracle of the Conference itself.

In order to convey some adequate impression of the proceedings of the Conference, I have thought it well, over and above the introductory and closing chapters, to devote a whole chapter to each of the subjects which were handled by the Conference; and, so far as space has allowed, I have included a good many of the actual words of the papers read and speeches delivered. Such long quotations are perhaps somewhat apt to be a little tiresome to the reader, but I let them stand because they do after all represent the thinking on these subjects of some of the leading theologians of the world.

I should like to express my great indebtedness and lively thanks to those of my fellow-delegates at Lausanne who have so signally increased the value of this book by contributing, at my request, memoranda on the work of the sections and on the work of the Conference generally. These contributors are, each of them, named in the pages that follow at the points in the chapters where their contributions have been incorporated.

My warm thanks are due also to my friends Dr Tissington Tatlow and Mr Hugh Martin of the Student Movement for all their advice and help so willingly given in writing the book and preparing it for the press; and to two other friends for labours of love in typing and proof-reading.

While I am not without hope that the book may reach and interest some American readers, and although I have endeavoured in reporting the Conference always to give due space and weight to the American point of view at Lausanne, I ought perhaps to explain that I have written in the main for British readers, Anglican and Free Church, from a British point of view, and in the light of the Reunion situation as it is in this country at the present time.

EDWARD S. WOODS

The Vicarage
Croydon
20*th November* 1927

INTRODUCTION

It is of the highest importance that the great gathering held at Lausanne in August 1927 should be recounted as this little book recounts it. The story of the origin and work of that Conference had to be told in such form as to meet the needs and stimulate the interest of the ordinary reader. Not everyone will be able to buy the larger volume, *Faith and Order*, which has just been put out by the same publishers under the honourable editorship of Canon Bate. Our gratitude is therefore due to Canon Woods for having given us this short and vivid account.

With all my heart I commend the book. It will serve to inform or remind every reader how much had gone to the making of the Lausanne Conference, how much was there accomplished, and how well grounded are our hopes for greater things to come.

RANDALL CANTUAR:

Lambeth Palace
23rd November 1927

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	FRONTISPIECE. A GROUP OF THE DELEGATES	
	AUTHOR'S PREFACE	1
	INTRODUCTION, BY THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY	5
CHAP. I.	THE YEARS BEFORE	9
II.	A UNIQUE GATHERING	25
III.	ONE GOSPEL	35
IV.	WHAT IS THE CHURCH?	53
V.	A COMMON FAITH	71
VI.	AMBASSADORS FOR CHRIST	86
VII.	THE BROTHERHOOD MEAL	105
VIII.	CHRISTENDOM AND CHURCH UNITY . .	126
IX.	NET GAINS	147
X.	"WHAT NEXT?"	167
	EPILOGUE	182

APPENDICES

A.	LIST OF CHURCHES REPRESENTED AT LAUSANNE	185
B.	THE CONTINUATION COMMITTEE APPOINTED AT LAUSANNE	189

LAUSANNE 1927

I

THE YEARS BEFORE

On Midsummer Day 1910, in a great hall in the ancient City of Edinburgh, something happened that was destined to be a landmark in Church history. Nay, more than a landmark, for landmarks and milestones are in themselves dead things; and the happening of this day was the birth of something living, and foreordained to be the parent of other living things. The hall was the Assembly Hall of the United Free Church of Scotland. The occasion was the final session of the epoch-making (the adjective is now seen to be accurate) World Missionary Conference, with delegates from all over the world and from most branches of the Christian Church. For days the Conference had wrestled with many aspects of the Church's stupendous enterprise. It was clear now beyond all doubt that the task was, and would continue to be, almost hopeless without a far higher degree of co-operation between the different sections of Christendom. And the immediate and practical question for the Conference was to decide whether or no their co-operating and unifying work was to be given continuity. "There was in the Conference that day," says one who was present, and who

subsequently told the story of the Conference in vivid fashion,[1] "a peculiar emotional intensity in the proceedings, the undefined sense experienced by all that a gravely significant thing was being enacted." And when, at the end of the day, the decision to hold together was taken, with a completely unanimous vote behind it, the whole Conference rose to its feet and burst into the Doxology.

Could the future have been looked into, the praises would have been more fervent still. For that Edinburgh World Conference opened a new chapter in the story of Christian unity. It was freely and truthfully said at Edinburgh, where for the first time "High Church" Missionary Societies conferred with those of "Evangelical" outlook, that such a gathering would have been impossible ten years before. But now, before the eyes of all Christendom, the 1910 Conference was itself unassailable evidence that the period, centuries old, of isolation and distrust, of rigid and taken-for-granted separation, had begun to pass away. To trace the causes of this change, and in particular the part played by the Student Christian Movement since the 'nineties in bringing it about, would lie outside the limits of this book. Suffice it to say here, that after Edinburgh, members of different communions, and of different parties in the same communion, began to get used to the idea that they could confer together, pray together, and in many ways work together, without any compromise of principle. The "inter-denominational" principle was now seen to be a sound one. And, more

[1] *Edinburgh* 1910, by W. H. T. Gairdner.

important still, men began to see that what the different Churches stood for, might turn out to be not mutually antagonistic, but complementary ; in other words, that the richest and truest kind of Christian unity is not that of the Least Common Denominator, but of the Greatest Common Measure, a unity of the perfect whole comprising and assimilating all the contributions of the several parts.

With ideas of this kind beginning to stir strongly in men's minds throughout the Church, it was inevitable that they should begin to inquire whether these conceptions might not also be applicable in regions of Church life that lay outside the strictly limited scope of the Edinburgh Conference. No Christian in his senses could suppose that the present shattered state of Christendom really represents Christ's plan for His Church. Might it not be that the day is drawing near when the Church must consider, not just how to arrange co-operation in specific tasks, but how to find a unified organic life ? If there could be a World Conference—and such a completely successful one —concerned with the Church's Missionary task, might there not one day be held a World Conference at which the different Churches would come together, in a spirit of true fellowship, to think out their agreements and disagreements in the vital questions of Faith and Church order, and so at least prepare the way for the re-fashioning of that One Body through which the one Christ might more perfectly give Himself to the world ?

Of such living, organic, Christian unity, many had dreamed dreams long before " Edinburgh 1910." But it was through Edinburgh that men

began to ask—and specially the practical Anglo-Saxon mind—Cannot something be done about this?

In particular there was one man, one of the most clear-headed and devoted of the United States delegates, who began to "think furiously," and to put very definitely to himself the question hinted at above. That man, Bishop Brent, was destined to lead the seventeen years' movement which culminated in "Lausanne," and himself, as chairman, to guide the Conference when at last it came into being. At Edinburgh, and after Edinburgh, the idea was talked over by various Church leaders, and three months later, at the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America, held at Cincinnati in October 1910, the following Report of their Joint Committee was joyfully accepted, and the suggested Resolution passed unanimously. The Report and the Resolution ran as follows:—

"Your Committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe further, that all Christian Communions are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of

love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a Conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity.

"With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following Resolution:—

"'WHEREAS, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him:

"'RESOLVED, That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention.'"

It was a wise method that this Resolution suggested. Our American brothers felt that clever and learned controversialists had on all sides said

what can be said, in defence and attack, about various churches. "Let us now," they suggested in effect, "have a holiday from controversy. Let us pile our arms and have a good long talk in No-man's Land, not striving to prove our opponents, or alienated friends to be wrong, but rather seeking to know what they really mean, and aim at."

Earnest, intelligent men are often as ignorant of the exact opinions and methods of fellow Christians in a different camp, as an average German soldier in 1914 was of the spirit, aims, and strength of the British Empire and army. "Let us," said the American peace makers, "ask leaders of all the Christian sects to come together for friendly talk about those questions of Faith and Order which keep us apart. Brotherly intercourse is in itself a sacrament of love. Let men meet to find out what it is that, in each case, gives life and happiness to their separate friends." [1]

In the winter after the passing of the Cincinnati resolution the Joint Commission therein propounded was duly appointed, and out of this was later appointed a Business Committee, which Business Committee was responsible for the actual work of promoting the World Conference. Mr Robert H. Gardiner, an American layman of wealth and standing, became Secretary of this Committee, and it was in no small degree due to his deep belief in the possibilities of a world conference, and his passionate longing for unity, that the difficulties were overcome and a conference as widely representative as Lausanne was ultimately convened. Gardiner died in the summer of 1924, and at the time of his death had correspondents numbering

[1] *Cf.* an article by the Bishop of Limerick in the *Christian Union Quarterly*, July 1927.

eighteen thousand, from every Church, and writing to him in every tongue. "He was," writes Dr Tissington Tatlow,[1] "a delightful person; the best type of cultured American, with a great deal of personal charm. His tenacity was amazing. He carried on a long correspondence with me for twelve years and never seemed to forget anything I wrote to him, although I was only one of an enormous number of correspondents. I always saw him when he visited England, which he did frequently, and always found him at work interesting ever-widening circles in the Conference. He did not, to begin with, know a great deal about the various branches of the Orthodox Church, but informed himself with great care in order that he might make the right approaches, and it was due to him as much as to any man that so many of the Orthodox Church were present. It was a great disappointment to him that he failed with the Church of Rome."

In June 1912, the American Church sent a deputation to Europe. The deputation consisted of Dr Anderson, Bishop of Chicago; Dr Boyd Vincent, Bishop of Ohio; Dr Hall, Bishop of Vermont; and the Rev. Dr Manning, Rector of Trinity Church, New York. They came in touch with leaders of almost all Christian denominations, and their proposals for holding a great conference were approved, or definitely accepted, by all those approached, save by the Pope. He gave them a gracious personal reception, but intimated that, as his denomination has nothing to learn from, or concede to, the outsiders who reject his claims to supremacy and infallibility, there was no common ground for discussion.

[1] For most of the facts narrated in the following pages I am indebted to Dr Tatlow.

It was a considerable set-off to the Roman refusal that co-operation was promised by the ancient Churches of the East—the patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, as well as those of Bulgaria and Rumania.

The deputation met the Archbishops of Canterbury and York at Lambeth Palace on 25th June, there being present some of the English Bishops, and a few members of the Lower Houses of Convocation. As the outcome of the Conference it was decided that the two Archbishops should appoint a committee selected from episcopal, clerical, and lay members of the Church of England, and that " this committee should watch the progress of the arrangements for the proposed Conference, organize support, and help in England for this endeavour, and specially stimulate general interest and regular and widespread prayer in the matter."

In the autumn of the same year the Archbishops appointed a committee of twenty persons, designating Dr Kenyon, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, as Chairman, and suggesting to the Chairman that one of the members they appointed, Mr Tissington Tatlow, should be invited to act as secretary. This Committee held its first meeting in the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey, on 7th July 1913. In all it met twenty times, its last meeting being on 26th May 1926.

In the same year, 1913, on 8th May, a Conference was held at the Astor Hotel in New York, of representatives of the different Commissions in the United States, and a meeting of the Episcopal Church Commission was held on 20th May, also in New York. One of the subjects most under dis-

cussion on this later occasion, was how the non-Episcopal Churches in the British Isles might be interested in the Conference. Most of them had been sent letters of invitation, but the response had been very small. It was urged that the same steps should be taken as had been taken in relation to the Church of England, namely, that an influential deputation should be sent to England to visit the Free Churches. This advice was taken and acted upon, and resulted in a deputation being appointed, consisting of the Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D. (Congregational); the Rev. W. H. Roberts, D.D. (Presbyterian); Bishop John W. Hamilton (Methodist Episcopal), and the Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D. (Disciples of Christ). They paid their visit in January 1914, the Free Church Council in London entertaining them, on their arrival, at a banquet, when the purpose of their visit was made known, and they subsequently paid a round of visits to the Free Churches in Great Britain, in most instances securing the appointment of a commission to help them to prepare for the Conference, where one had not already been appointed.

During this visit an earnest desire was expressed, especially by Mr Robert Gardiner, that some contact should be established between the Church of England Committee and the Free Church Commissions, appointed to help in the preparation for the Conference. The American deputation also met the Church of England Committee on 29th January 1914. At this meeting the question of contact between the Anglican and Free Church Committees was freely discussed, and at a further meeting on 17th February 1914, a sub-committee

consisting of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Dean of Westminster (Bishop Ryle), the Rev. Tissington Tatlow, Professor Beresford Pite, and Mr Athelstan Riley were appointed to arrange for a meeting between representatives of the Church of England and the other Commissions. Two meetings were subsequently held on 21st April and 15th June 1914. Out of these rose the appointment of a joint committee of the Anglican and Free Churches. This joint committee continued its work for four years, and during that period issued two of the most important reports which, up to that time, had appeared in England on the subject of unity, and which constitute important landmarks in the long history of Reunion negotiations. They were each entitled "Towards Christian Unity." The first interim report appeared in February 1916, and was signed by the Bishops of Bath and Wells (Kenyon), Winchester (Talbot), Oxford (Gore), the Revs. W. T. Davison, A. E. Garvie, J. Scott Lidgett, J. H. Shakespeare, C. Anderson Scott, Tissington Tatlow, and Dr Eugene Stock. The second interim report was issued in February 1918. All who had signed the previous report signed this one, but the group having been enlarged, the following also signed :—Revs. H. L. Goudge, W. B. Selbie, William Temple, and Mr H. G. Wood.

These documents plainly had an influence upon the work of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 in its relation to the problem of unity.

In 1920, from August 12th to 20th, at Geneva, a Conference of 127 men was held. They represented forty countries and seventy Churches. This gathering was the result of an invitation to the

Commissions which had been appointed, inviting them to send not more than three delegates to this Conference "to arrange for the further conduct of the movement." The British representatives who attended this Conference, and also attended the World Conference at Lausanne, were the following:—Dr Vernon Bartlett, Dr Robert Forgan, Miss Lucy Gardner, Bishop Gore, the Bishop of Ossory (Dr Gregg), Dr H. Maldwyn Hughes, the Rev. Prof. D. M. Kay, the Rev. J. A. M'Clymont, D.D., the Rev. Owen Prys, the Rev. J. E. Roberts, the Rev. William Robinson, and the Rev. Tissington Tatlow.

This Conference was friendly in character, but was not on the whole a great success. It had no very clear agenda, and tended to wander from one topic to another. It led, however, to the appointment of a Continuation Committee, and the Continuation Committee at once appointed a Subjects Committee, with the Bishop of Bombay (Dr Palmer), as Convener.[1] Although in the event, the programme formulated by the Subjects Committee was not actually used, a careful summary of its work was prepared by Canon Bate, and it is probably largely due to the existence of this document and to the fact that many of the groups into which the World Conference was divided, used it, that the Lausanne Conference escaped, to a very large extent, the pitfalls of the Geneva Conference of 1920, and led to very much more definite results.

So much for the organized preparation which, from 1910 onwards, paved the way for "Lausanne 1927." But any attempt to trace the forces at

[1] *See* Chapter III., p. 35.

work making for Christian unity during those seventeen years must clearly mention two other, and powerful, factors in the situation. The first and the biggest was the War. The War shook all men's thinking to its foundations, and Christian thinking could not—indeed it did not ask to—escape from the shock. In the rending of civilizations and the toppling of nations, with the moral foundations of Christendom seeming to crack and sag, amid the stark realities of life and death, the divisions between the Christian Churches suddenly looked indescribably petty. When the issue was Christ or chaos, denominational differences appeared absurdly diminutive, and when Padre ministered to dying soldier in muddy trench, neither bothered about their respective ecclesiastical attachments.

The effect of all this, on the minds of the generation that bore the brunt of the War, was profound and ineffaceable. Many Christians of many denominations, both clerics and laymen, saw at that time a vision of a renovated, re-united Church, a vision which since then may indeed have "tarried," but has never faded. And the Chaplains at the end of the War, fired, not only by their war experiences, but also by some memorable Unity Conferences at Béthune, Blendecques, and elsewhere, spoke out their mind to the Church with some vigour. In a joint book called *The Church in the Furnace*,[1] in which the Deputy Chaplain-General (Bishop Gwynne of Khartum) and some other leading Chaplains collaborated, they spoke frankly of their longing, shared by many other Christians, to

[1] Usually known among the Padres as "The Fat in the Fire"! The book ran through many editions.

rescue religion from its pre-war ruts, and intimated pointedly the kind of reforms which they felt the Church ought forthwith to take in hand. And, to do the Church of England justice, it did, in the reconstruction period which followed the War, drastically reconstruct its whole machinery so as to become, within certain limits, a truly self-governing Church: a process of reform which has unquestionably made it more elastic both in counsel and in action, and so more free, and on the whole more disposed, to give serious attention to problems of Reunion.

Meantime the Church at home, passing through similar, though not quite so shattering, spiritual experiences, also found the question of unity looming large and urgent; and the new thoughts and hopes began to find vent in a series of notable conferences, attended by leading Anglicans and Free Churchmen, held at Mansfield College, Oxford, and at Swanwick, in the years 1918, 1919, and 1920. These conferences, which registered a considerable measure of agreement, were characterized by some strenuous and effective joint thinking, and were further noteworthy in the fact that representative members of the "Catholic" wing of the Church of England were present and found themselves able to explore without misgivings the projected paths to Reunion.

And so, in this and in many other ways, the ground was cleared for the great 1920 Lambeth Conference of all the Bishops of the world-wide Anglican Communion, among whose far-reaching results not the least was the fresh impetus it gave to the Reunion movement all over the world. The "Appeal to all Christian people," addressed

to Christendom by the 252 Bishops assembled in conclave, was a great gesture, worthy of the one Lord and Master of us all; fine in spirit, and noble in wording, it did more at one stroke to mend the divisions of Christendom than had been done, or attempted, for centuries. The Conference was not afraid to strike the note of penitence: "We acknowledge this condition [in Christendom] of broken fellowship to be contrary to God's will, and we desire frankly to confess our share in the guilt of thus crippling the Body of Christ and hindering the activity of His Spirit." And, while sketching in broad outline the kind of conditions which in its judgment might make Reunion possible, it held up before the world a satisfyingly wide and glorious vision of the Church that is to be: "the vision which rises before us is that of a Church, genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering into its fellowship all 'who profess and call themselves Christians,' within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common, and made serviceable to the whole Body of Christ. Within this unity Christian Communions now separated from one another would retain much that has long been distinctive in their methods of worship and service. It is through a rich diversity of life and devotion that the unity of the whole fellowship will be fulfilled. This means an adventure of goodwill and still more of faith, for nothing less is required than a new discovery of the creative resources of God. To this adventure we are convinced that God is now calling all the members of His Church."

This "Appeal to all Christian People," sent forth in August 1920, was cordially received by all the Churches to which it was sent, and led, in this country, as was right and natural, to a long course of communications and negotiations with the Free Churches. There was set up, almost at once, a Joint Conference, consisting of the two Archbishops and ten other Bishops with twenty-five Free Church leaders, which from 1921 to 1925 held a series of meetings, not so much for negotiation as for elucidation and explanation, and which produced, as time went on, a number of statements, reports, and memoranda—all of them of value in clearing the ground and, so to say, making tentative sketch-drawings of the Church of the future. At the moment the proceedings of the Joint Conference have come to an end, in order that, as its members have stated, "full opportunity may be given to the Churches represented on the Conference to study and understand the documents already submitted." Perhaps therefore it is too strong to speak, as some have done, of the proceedings reaching a deadlock, though it is undeniable that in many quarters, both Anglican and Nonconformist, grave disappointment has been felt at the seemingly rigid attitude of the negotiators on the Anglican side, and their apparent declension from the generous recognitions and wide view of the original Lambeth Appeal. However, as those who long for unity may thankfully note, the actual achievements of Lambeth and the post-Lambeth Conferences are solid and secure. The sheer *fact* of the Appeal altered the whole situation with regard to Church unity, and opened up ways of

approach to the Reunion question which still await fuller exploration. And the Conferences that followed brought out into the clear light of day two facts which are, as far as they go, remarkably strong foundations for all future Reunion work: first, the recognition on the part of the Anglican Church that the Free Church (non-Episcopal) ministries are "true ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church," and, secondly, the discovery of a profound and practically complete agreement on the fundamental things of the Christian faith as these are set forth in the chief creeds of Christendom. As the Moderator of the Federal Council of the Free Churches (Dr Carnegie Simpson) said publicly and emphatically in his address to the Council on 20th September, 1926—"Of this agreement we should make far more than we do. We should not let it be too much affected by subsequent differences on questions of polity or order."

"Lausanne" therefore was very far from being unheralded and unprepared for. It can hardly be accused, even by the most cautious Churchmen, of being precipitate or untimely. Indeed, in view of all that happened during the previous decades, there was surely about Lausanne a providential *inevitability*. It had to be. For Christendom, in view of all the circumstances, to have refused to make the attempt which was made at Lausanne, would have constituted a grave lack of faith, and betrayed a serious blindness to the signs of the times. What use Lausanne made of its God-given opportunity, the pages that follow will endeavour to tell.

II

A UNIQUE GATHERING

The ancient Swiss city of Lausanne, with its red roofs and wide view of the blue lake below, can hardly, in all its long history, have witnessed such a diverse assemblage of people as, on the morning of 3rd August, 1927, was to be seen wending its way up through the steep and narrow streets to the great Cathedral. That which was bringing these people to the Cathedral was the opening Service of the long-planned and long-awaited World Conference on Faith and Order, now at last beginning its three weeks' work in this hospitable Swiss town.

"They shall come from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, and shall sit down in the Kingdom of God." From all points of the compass, from every corner of the earth, from almost every part of Christ's universal Church, came the four hundred delegates to take their places in the Cathedral that bright August morning. Watch them as they enter the great West door. Here are Orthodox Patriarchs and Bishops from the Balkans, Greece, Asia Minor, and Syria. Here are leaders of the Anglican Communion, with names known and honoured across the world: Bishop Gore, the Bishop of Gloucester (Dr Headlam), the Bishop of Manchester (Dr Temple), the Archbishop of Armagh (Dr D'Arcy), and many

another. Here are a group of distinguished Free Churchmen—Dr Garvie (Vice-Chairman of the Conference), Dr Peake, Dr Vernon Bartlett, Sir Henry Lunn, and Scotch Presbyterians such as Dr Forgan and Dr Norman Maclean. Here come some of the Americans to whose drive and energy the Conference owes so much—Bishop Brent (our Chairman), Bishop Perry, Bishop M'Connell, Dr Atkinson, Dr Adams Brown, and others. Those men next to them are renowned leaders in the Protestant Churches in Europe : Archbishop Söderblom of Upsala, Pastor Wilfrid Monod of Paris (with the face of a saint and mystic), Dr Adolf Deissmann, the great scholar, Professor Titius, Dr Keller of Zurich, and others from Czecho-Slovakia, Denmark, Hungary, Rumania, Norway, Finland, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia. And here come men from lands where the Christian Church is still comparatively young : the Bishop of Bombay, Bishop Azariah, Bishop Tubbs, from India, Dr Timothy Lew of China, Dr Inagaki of the Nippon Sei Kokwai (the Anglican Church in Japan). There is hardly a corner of the earth, hardly a nation, hardly a Church, that is unrepresented in this Swiss Cathedral to-day. There is no Roman Catholic in the company, and the Baptists are almost entirely without representatives. Every other Communion, "Protestant" or "Catholic," of any kind of size or standing, has its delegate or delegates here. And most of the Churches have obviously taken pains to choose their delegates from among the strongest leaders and the ablest scholars they possess, and among men holding high office in their communions. There

are 12 archbishops and 22 bishops attending the Conference; of these, 9 archbishops and 6 bishops are "Orthodox" and "Old Catholic," while 3 archbishops and 16 bishops are "Anglican"—English, Irish, Australian, Canadian, South African, and American. While the books written by the theologians and writers in this assemblage would surely fill a large library! All of which means that the Churches concerned have taken "Lausanne" very seriously in thus sending men of weight and learning to represent them. But it also means, inevitably, that the youthful element is largely lacking. And there are not a few signs that if Youth is to have its say in the matter, the whole Unity movement will be so speeded up that the present, middle-aged leaders of the movement may be left panting behind.

And what is it that brings this unprecedentedly diverse assemblage to worship and to confer together? The binding link, the urgent motive in the minds of all these men, is a deep and common conviction that the divided and sub-divided state of the Christian Church is not only productive of paralysing ineffectiveness in its work of spreading God's Kingdom, but is directly contrary to the mind of Christ. This loss of unity, as Bishop Brent reminded us in his inaugural sermon, is the common fault of the whole Christian world; and if it is to be regained that will only come about by the concerted action of the whole Christian world. Every section has shared in shattering it: each must share in restoring it. St Paul, he added, strikes sectarianism of all the ages between the eyes by calling it "carnal." And Christendom is

challenged to-day to set its own house in order before it infects Africa and the East with a sectarianism which spoils the Gospel and gives the spiritually hungry a stone instead of bread. We were never allowed to forget this challenge at Lausanne. The men from the Far East saw to that. Again and again came the plea, specially from India and China, for a united Church and a single front, for an ending, once and for all, of the pernicious and senseless foisting of our Western divisions on the young Church in those lands. The Church in some parts of the Mission field, as the Bishop of Tinnevelly pointedly told the Conference, could solve the problem of unity if the Church at the home base would allow them. "If missionaries," he cried, "feel their natural love and loyalty to the Mother Church strained to breaking-point, how much more do Indian, African, Chinese, and Japanese Christians chafe at the unnatural barriers which are imposed upon them. If to move forward is dangerous, it is far more dangerous to sit still."

Deeply as we all felt the force of this challenge, and greatly as some of us longed, and long, to see an immediate response to it, we were nevertheless bound to remember, what our wise Chairman was careful to keep before our minds, that the declared object of our Conference was not to attempt to define the conditions of Reunion, but "to register the apparent level of fundamental agreements within the Conference, and the grave points of disagreement remaining; and also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement." That may not sound a very ambitious programme. But in the event,

what was actually accomplished, as most of us felt, turned out to be little short of miracle. The story of the way in which the Conference, in sectional and plenary meetings, honestly faced its disagreements *and* found an unexpectedly large measure of agreement on some of the hitherto most divisive theological and ecclesiastical questions, will be told in the chapters that follow. Here, in these first words about the Conference's beginnings, and the way in which it took hold of its task, let it be said in the plainest possible fashion that the dominating thing about Lausanne was the general consciousness from first to last that we were all not just nominally but *really* " one in Christ."

That sense of a real spiritual unity, transcending formidable differences, was perhaps the greatest miracle of the Conference. None of us knew beforehand that it would be so ; at the end, none of us doubted that it had been so. And it is hardly rhetorical to use the word " miracle." It is not possible to exaggerate the diversity and divergence of the elements that composed the Conference. When at the first full session one looked around on this apparent babel of tongues, traditions, and theologies, it seemed almost inconceivable that any principles of unity could emerge from such a congeries of dissimilar elements. Yet, as the days went on, the principles of unity kept emerging all the time. We knew we loved the same Christ and served the same Kingdom ; especially we knew it when we sang and prayed together. In the Cathedral at the Opening Service, and at the mid-Conference Service of Penitence and Intercession, as well as in the daily devotions before our sessions

in the hall of the University, it was a deeply moving experience to repeat altogether, each in his own language, the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed, and to join together in such universal hymns of the Church as "The Church's One Foundation," "Holy, Holy, Holy," "Ein Feste Burg," and "Now Thank we all our God." An American delegate records that he will never forget standing by an Archbishop of the Eastern Orthodox Church and singing out of the same book with the Archbishop in German and he, the American, in English, "In the Cross of Christ I glory." This oneness of spirit showed itself in many ways. There was, throughout the full sessions and in the more intimate discussion in the smaller sections, an earnestness, a spirit of prayer, a mutual courtesy, a desire to understand and appreciate another's point of view, and an effort to get together without compromise of conviction, which made a very deep impression on all who took part in the proceedings. "To have participated in the Conference," writes one who was present, "was a spiritual benediction."

All the plenary sessions of the Conference were held in the *Aula* or Great Hall of the University, most kindly placed at our disposal by the Civic and University Authorities of Lausanne. Indeed, nothing could exceed the gracious courtesy of the Swiss in their welcome to the Conference and their admirable provision for its needs; they lived up to their high reputation as perfect hosts for all kinds of international gatherings. They welcomed us officially at the first session, and thereafter did all in their power to make our stay in their charming

city as pleasant as possible, even arranging one day for a delightful steamer trip up the lake to the Castle of Chillon, inviting all Conference members and their families to come on the excursion as guests of the Municipality of Lausanne.

The Conference was fortunate in its Chairman and Vice-Chairman, Bishop Brent and Dr A. E. Garvie. To guide such an assembly in such a task called for powers of no ordinary kind; and the Conference owed a great deal to the gracious dignity, the knowledge of procedure, the wise decisions, and the fine spiritual leadership of these two men—men to whom the whole Reunion movement is indebted to an extent which can never be measured. The Conference was also well served by the plan of procedure which had been devised by the Continuation Committee, and which worked out well. By this plan the six main subjects before the Conference were first presented in full session by appointed speakers (their addresses being available in print in the three languages, English, French, and German), and then assigned to sections, and sub-sections, for detailed and prolonged discussion. The advantage of this method was obvious, in giving to all delegates due opportunity to make their own contributions to the total work of the Conference. A few days later the reports of the sections were discussed by the Conference in full session, and then sent back, with suggested revisions, to the various drafting committees. Finally, they came back again to the full Conference and were then, with or without still further emendations, " received " by the Conference to be referred to the participating Churches for their considera-

tion and study. These reports thus "received," and handed on by the Conference, form an epitome of its work, and will be found, each in its own place, set out in full in the chapters that follow.

At any international conference the business of interpretation is irksome but essential, if there is to be any real conferring. As a distinguished lay delegate from Egypt remarked, "It is part of the sacrifice we are called upon to pay for unity." Some speakers of uncommon linguistic ability translated their own speeches forthwith into the other two languages. But most relied on the official interpreters, who deserved well of the Conference. And the chairmen were right to be strict in this matter. There is, in such a conference, no surer method of losing the sympathy and interest of insignificant minorities than inattention by a chairman to the necessity of fulfilling immediately the courtesy of translation, and never allowing the discussion to run forward in the language of one section only.

Perhaps most of the really effective "conferring" was done, not in the Conference Hall, or with the aid of interpreters, but in the intimacy of quiet conversation, in groups or in pairs, in the lounges of Lausanne hotels, or sipping coffee on some pleasant restaurant terrace overlooking the lake. Most of the delegates—especially those from the Continent of Europe, who are notoriously better linguists than Anglo-Saxons!—could produce enough "foreign language" for such a purpose, and through this friendly intercourse, many a man obtained a newer and a truer conception of the religion and theology of Churches of which before

he had had little knowledge, and towards which he felt scant sympathy. Thus Baptist learnt from Orthodox, and Orthodox from Anglican, and Anglican from Lutheran, and Lutheran from Old Catholic—and so on, all the way round. When men are ready to learn, to remove misconceptions and let go of prejudices, when they are prepared even—as the Archbishop of Armagh and the Bishop of Bombay both urged in notable speeches—to change their minds, then an atmosphere is created in which it is possible for the Spirit of Christ to guide corporately those who belong to His Church and seek to do His will.

This chapter, which seeks to convey something of the spirit in which the Conference met, and of the way in which it set about its three weeks' task, may perhaps fitly conclude with the "Preamble" to the six Reports: a document which, drafted by Bishop Brent, and received (and very cordially applauded) by the Conference, is itself an admirable epitome of "Lausanne 1927."

"We, REPRESENTATIVES of many Christian communions throughout the world, assembled to consider, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, the things wherein we agree and the things wherein we differ, receive the following series of reports as containing subject-matter for the consideration of our respective Churches in their common search for unity.

"This is a Conference summoned to consider matters of Faith and Order. It is emphatically *not* attempting to define the conditions of future Reunion. Its object is to register the apparent level of fundamental agreements within the Conference

and the grave points of disagreements remaining: also to suggest certain lines of thought which may in the future tend to a fuller measure of agreement.

"Each subject on the agenda was first discussed in plenary session. It was then committed to one of the sections, of more than one hundred members each, into which the whole Conference was divided. The report, after full discussion in sub-sections, was finally drawn up and adopted unanimously, or by a large majority vote, by the section to which it had been committed. It was twice presented for further discussion to a plenary session of the Conference when it was referred to the Churches in its present form.

"Though we recognize the reports to be neither exhaustive nor in all details satisfactory to every member of the Conference, we submit them to the Churches for that deliberate consideration which could not be given in the brief period of our sessions. We further recommend that the whole material should be referred to a small commission of qualified men representative of the various groups—Orthodox, Evangelical, Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist, Anglican, etc.—and charged with the duty to carefully examine these propositions in the light of the discussions and to report thereon to the Churches. We thank God and rejoice over agreements reached; upon our agreements we build. Where the reports record differences, we call upon the Christian world to an earnest reconsideration of the conflicting opinions now held, and a strenuous endeavour to reach the truth as it is in God's mind, which should be the foundation of the Church's unity."

III

ONE GOSPEL

Delegates who came to Lausanne hoping for a nice little holiday were rudely disillusioned! The programme put before the Conference by those commissioned, some years previously, to draw it up, was bound, if it was to be adequately tackled, to involve many hours of hard work for every day of the available three weeks. And, be it recorded to the credit of the average Conference member, there was no shirking. Unheeding the lure of tempting trips to the mountains, and despite a week or two of sweltering heat, the delegates stuck to their work manfully, and everyone "pulled his weight" from beginning to end.

It may be of interest to indicate the origins of the programme on which the Lausanne Conference worked. The preparatory Conference at Geneva in 1920[1] appointed a "Continuation Committee," which in its turn appointed a "Subjects Committee," with the Bishop of Bombay as Convener, to undertake the work of preparing a programme for the World Conference if, and when, it should be held. This Subjects Committee did a great deal of work and secured numerous reports from all over the world in reply to the questions it sent out. The programme subsequently formulated

[1] *See* Chapter I., p. 19.

was not in the event actually used, but the summary of it, prepared by Canon Bate, was of the greatest assistance both to individual members of the Conference and to the work of the sections. The programme as finally shaped and accepted by the Conference for its use provided for the discussion of the following subjects :—

The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel.
The Nature of the Church.
The Church's Common Confession of Faith.
The Ministry of the Church.
The Sacraments.
The Unity of Christendom and the Relation thereto of Existing Churches.

The first subject handled by the Conference, "The Church's Message to the World — the Gospel," tested at once, and inevitably, the character and quality of the Conference. If we could not agree about our Message to the world, the question of further agreements or disagreements was bound to have an air of considerable unreality. However, in the event, this proved to be the one subject on which there was absolute agreement; even the Orthodox representatives who felt obliged subsequently to define their own attitude, and difficulties with regard to the other subjects, affirmed their complete unity with the rest of the Conference upon this. Those who complain, not without justice sometimes, that the different sections of the Church speak with different voices when they seek to present the Gospel to the world, may well note that these representatives from nearly all the Churches found it possible

to define that Gospel in a statement which commended itself to all.

The first of the two main speakers was Professor Adolf Deissmann, of Berlin University, one of the most distinguished living linguistic scholars, who charmed the Conference, not only by the profound thinking in his paper, but also by the genial way in which he handled the work, and subsequently presented the report, of this section. In this paper he went right back to the beginnings of Christianity (the greatest of all the spiritual movements of mankind), and argued that the germ of the Gospel was the glowing words, "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." This message, he said, is yet indestructible in its primitive evangelical force, and from this primal source of strength it continually regains its ancient, victorious, and messianic passion. This message was direct, not to individual souls only, but to the world—to mankind in general. The Christian watchword "Evangelium," in its original significance, meant the joyful message of Jesus of Nazareth that the Kingdom of God is at hand. It was interesting for Anglo-Saxon listeners to hear the speaker, in this connection, draw attention to the fact that only one language—English—has succeeded in finding an entirely true translation of this watchword and in creating for it a popular equivalent which was to experience a rich history of its own. The possession of the word "gospel" ("Godspell," "God-tidings") is one of the greatest spiritual treasures entrusted to English-speaking Christendom. This original Christian Gospel was inseparably united with the inexorable demand for the

inner transformation of each individual. The Church must, he said, preach the fearfulness of sin and the glory of grace.

And, he added, if this preaching task is to be done with power, it will have to be done not merely as a "dogmatic teaching of the intellect, but as a prophetic and authoritative shaking of the conscience and will. It must not dictate paragraphs: it must sound the trumpet. It must not set forth the Kingdom of God as an institution long present in our midst; rather, before the eyes of those who have been awakened to be fellow-labourers in God's harvest, it must present the Kingdom with moving seriousness as the *unum necessarium*, the one thing needful, as the great and unattained goal of all things, as judgment to come, and as redemption to come. And all this must be done with apostolical fervour and warmth, through concentration of the heart upon the living Master.

"The Church must give up the attempt to demonstrate the rationality of the Kingdom of God to the healthy intelligence of mankind. It must have courage and joyfulness to proclaim paradox to the world and to expect paradox from the world: the paradox that by reason of the nearness of God and of His Anointed we must be new men, and that in following God's Anointed, we must be the salt of the earth and the light of the world!"

For such evangelization *unity is essential*. Not, the speaker hastened to add, uniformity. "In their theology, in the details of their liturgy, in their methods of education and of practical work,

in the productions of their art, of their poetry and music, the Churches may rightly continue to work out the manifold gifts entrusted to them in manifold ways. But in their message to the world they must be at one, they must form a united front. The unseen waves of the divine message of the Gospel which vibrate over the globe, ought not to be destroyed and confused by contrary waves from those who are broadcasting a competition of ill-will. 'If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?'"[1]

The second main speech was from Bishop Francis M'Connell, of the American Methodist Episcopal Church. He said that our formal theological creeds might be inadequate as creeds, but all were central in their aim at enforcing the belief that not only in Christ do we see God, but in God we see Christ. If Christianity is to carry its Gospel to the whole world the stress must be kept on this Godward reference to Christianity. The Gospel must, he argued, reach all phases of life, all group, as well as individual, activities.

It cannot be said that the study of its six subjects by the Lausanne Conference was other than thorough. Even apart from the discussions and subsequent reports, the prepared addresses on each subject by the chosen speakers form contributions to the study of that subject which will surely need henceforth to be taken into account by Christian thinkers in all lands. In addition to the half-hour papers read by the two first speakers, there were four quarter of an hour prepared addresses on the topic, by further selected speakers, all of which may be

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 8.

read verbatim in the full Conference Report.[1] The first of these four shorter speeches, on the Church's Message to the World, was made by a remarkable man and a trusted leader among the Orthodox, Dr Nicholas Glubokowsky, a Russian refugee, formerly a professor in the University of St Petersburg, and now a member of the faculty of the University of Bulgaria. As already indicated, he was able to show how closely the Orthodox shared the conception of the Gospel entertained by the other Churches at Lausanne. He was followed by one of the most distinguished Americans at the Conference, Dr William Adams Brown, a member of the Faculty of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, whose speech drew marks of enthusiastic appreciation from the Conference. He helped us to look forward as well as back. "However much we may value the past," he cried, "for us it can never be final. God has not yet spoken His last word or His best. Jesus Christ has not yet exhausted His power to redeem and to transform. There are still vast reaches of truth to be penetrated—new meanings in the old Gospel still to be disclosed."

After further interesting and helpful contributions by Dr Harold Ostenfeld, Bishop of Seeland, Denmark, and by Professor Wilfrid Monod, the well-known leader of French Protestantism, the Conference plunged into a frank and full discussion of the subject. To give exhaustive reports of these plenary discussions might be interesting, but would carry us far beyond the limits of this little book. It must be sufficient to indicate its general trend,

[1] See footnote to Preface.

and some of its more striking moments. From the German side, and from the heart of the movement inaugurated by Karl Barth, there came an impassioned appeal by Dr Gogarten for a presentation of the Gospel as the transcendent act of God's unmerited mercy—the Gospel is not a message of forgiveness, it is forgiveness; it is not a heralding of judgment, it is essentially the deliverance from judgment through faith. From the Eastern side, Professor Arseniew reminded us, in a speech of singular beauty, that the Gospel is rooted in the Resurrection, the revelation of life eternal and the breaking-through of a new reality, a new creation which the Holy Spirit in the Church, and in us all, is carrying onward towards its goal.

And then from the Mission Field, in this discussion as in all the others, the vital necessity of unity was proclaimed with a burning conviction which swayed the Conference as no abstract reasoning could do. Distinguished leaders from the Eastern world got up, one after the other, and sharply reminded the Conference that while unity may be a desirable ideal in Europe and America, it is *vital* to the life of the Church in the Mission Field. In view of the place which this particular topic—unity in the Mission Field—occupied throughout the whole Conference, and should surely always occupy in the minds of all Christians, it may be well at this point to quote at some length from a convincing speech made by Dr Azariah, Bishop of Dornakal in South India. "After nineteen centuries of Christianity, two-thirds of the world's population still remain outside the Church. In India alone we reckon that at

least one hundred millions of the people, or a third of the entire population, are beyond the reach of existing missionary organizations. China, with its four hundred millions, has even a sadder story to tell. Africa, with two hundred millions, is not Christian yet. Moreover the world is open to-day to the Gospel as it was in no previous generation. Africa is emerging out of its heathenism of ages. India is throbbing with new life from end to end—educated India is coming more and more under the spell of the teaching and Person of our Lord. Rural India is even more ready to accept Christ and His Gospel of regeneration and uplift. The outcastes are entering the Church at the rate of about 3000 a week. In my own diocese we have admitted during the last seven years 70,000 people. It has been said repeatedly that if only the Church had the vision and the devotion, the fifty million outcastes could be swept into the Church in our generation!

"And yet, with these world opportunities before it, the Church is feeble, its missionary work everywhere is undermanned, and its resources pitifully inadequate for this world task. The Church is feeble because it is divided. It has been confidently asserted that if only the Church were One, at home and abroad, we have now at our disposal all the resources in men and money required to evangelize the whole world in our generation.

"You know better than myself the wastage of Christian forces in the home lands. An Indian visitor is often saddened by seeing in some places churches built, and ministers appointed, not to meet the needs of enlarged membership, but to have different denominations represented in the

same locality. This—often unnecessary—multiplication goes on all the time that continents are asking for Gospel messengers, and backward and primitive races are clamouring for light and for the Gospel. Similar wastage is reproduced in the Mission Field. Four places of worship stand within a hundred yards of each other in one of the cities of India, each barely half-full at any ordinary Sunday service, all ministered to by underpaid ministers, each too often engaged in unceasing warfare—not against the sin and suffering all round, but—each against the supposed defects in the beliefs and practices of the others. Seven missionary societies are at work in my area among a population of a million people, five of which claim the exclusive possession of the Gospel truth, and therefore the right to enter and plant churches anywhere. Such a multiplication of churches in the same area renders Church discipline exceedingly difficult and ineffective. By our divisions, we not only waste our resources but also diminish the Church's effectiveness for righteousness and purity in non-Christian lands. Unity, organic unity, is the only remedy.

"Where the Gospel has entered in, the Church causes the non-Christian to stumble. Thinking men ask why, while claiming loyalty to the one Christ, we still worship separately, we still show exclusiveness in the most sacred acts of our religion. The divisions thus confuse the thoughtful enquirer. 'Which church shall I join?' is often asked by such a convert. The divisions of Christendom do not appeal to the Christians in these lands. Christians in India, for instance, did not have a share in creating the divisions of Christendom.

They entered into this ready-made system, and it has not really taken hold of them. Men become attached to this or that form of Church organization or polity only because their spiritual fathers belonged to that particular section. 'I am a Baptist,' said an Indian friend to me, 'not because of theology, but because of geography.' Having accidentally become attached to a Church, Indian Christians do not find it difficult, when necessary, to change their ecclesiastical allegiance to a Church other than their own. Restriction to such intercourse hurts them. It drives them either to be disloyal to their own Church, or to find fellowship with non-Christians, and thus often to become indifferent to all religion!

"The feeling of very many Indian Christians is that they were not responsible for the divisions of Christendom, neither would they perpetuate them. Force of habit, financial dependence, denominational training, and above all, loyalty to their spiritual fathers, now keep them in denominational connections. But these circumstances cannot keep them apart for ever.

"Another factor must be mentioned too. The rising tide of nationalism cannot be ignored. This new national spirit calls for national unity. The young Indian Christian cannot help being influenced by this new spirit. His patriotism moves him to do what he can to advance the interests of his own country, while his loyalty to Christ makes him long for his country to come into the full inheritance of Eternal Life in Jesus Christ. This national and Christian consciousness in consequence unites him with his fellow Christians of all Churches in the

common task of the material and spiritual regeneration of his country in and through Christ. The Church, alas! divides, with the result that spiritual fellowship with his countrymen is coming to be valued more than participation in common sacraments; and belief in institutional Christianity is in danger of disappearing in the younger generation. The young Indian Christian wants Christ, he throws himself heartily into every institution that unites him with his brethren in fellowship and service, but he has no use for a Church that divides.

"There is still another—even more serious—danger in India. Through our divisions we unconsciously become parties to the creation of caste churches. Caste is the bulwark of Hinduism. This religion, as was told me by one of its great exponents, does not stand for doctrine or belief, it stands for a life. It is very accommodating in religious practices; it is relentless only in the demands of caste. By caste men are placed in water-tight compartments. Beyond the caste circle there is no real social life, no inter-dining and certainly no inter-marriage. There is no worse force in the whole world that operates for separating man from man, and creating jealousy, suspicion, and strife between communities, than this hydra-headed monster—caste. In such a land there is being planted, by the grace of God, a Divine Society, which is meant to be One, which was created by God to be One, and whose one characteristic worship is, by the ordinance of its Divine Master—participation in one common sacred Food. Division in this society means exclusive communions and severed fellowship, and produces all the worst

effects of the Hindu caste system. When, added to this, different sects aim at establishing churches, each among people of a different caste, the evil is complete. Separate castes merge into separate denominations, and once more continue their unholy warfare of generations. This is actually taking place in some parts of the country.

"We are working together to discover some way of getting one united Church. We do not desire any one Church to absorb the others. We do not ask any one to deny its past spiritual heritage, we cannot demand the severance of fellowship of any of these churches within the churches in Europe or America that have planted them. But *we must have one Church*. We want a Church of India, a Church which can be our spiritual home, a Church where the Indian religious genius can find natural expression, a living branch of the Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, a Church which, being a visible symbol of unity in that divided land, will draw all men to our Blessed Lord.

"Unity may be theoretically a desirable ideal in Europe and America, but it is vital to the life of the Church in the Mission Field. The divisions of Christendom may be a source of weakness in Christian countries, but in non-Christian lands they are a sin and a scandal."

Dr Azariah's convincing speech was strikingly endorsed by one of his brother Bishops in India, Dr Norman Tubbs of Tinnevelly, who did not refrain from some salutary plain speaking (such "speaking the truth *in love*" was characteristic of all the Lausanne deliberations. Nobody hesitated to speak the truth as he saw it! "Sometimes,"

comments one of the delegates, "a speaker would score heavily, but there was never a bad loser!") The Bishop argued that "this restraint from the pillars of the Church at the Home Base is becoming intolerable. We must obey God rather than man. If missionaries feel their natural love and loyalty to the Mother Church strained to breaking point, how much more do Indian, African, Chinese, and Japanese Christians chafe at the unnatural barriers which are imposed upon them. If to move forward is dangerous, it is far more dangerous to sit still. The Church of the Apostolic Age was not afraid of running risks. Think of the immense adventure of that little Jewish Christian Church, when she allowed herself to be flooded with a great mass movement of despised heathen 'Gentile dogs' coming into the Church. Cannot the Christians in these days run risks? 'God has not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and of love and of a sound mind.'"

After India, China. That land of four hundred million souls, with its swiftly growing Christian Church, had an eloquent and able spokesman in the Rev. Timothy Lew, of the Union Church of North China. Dr Lew, who, with his Chinese garb, happy smile and friendly ways, became one of the most popular figures in the Conference, quoted a very relevant passage from China's National Christian Conference of a few years ago, which, speaking for all the Christian bodies in China (except the Roman Catholics) made the following affirmation:—"We Chinese Christians who represent the various leading denominations, express our regret that we are divided by the denomina-

tionalism which comes from the West. We are not unaware of the diverse gifts through the denominations that have been used by God for the enrichment of the Church. Yet we recognize fully that denominationalism is based upon differences, the historical significance of which, however real and vital to the missionaries from the West, are not shared by us Chinese. Therefore denominationalism, instead of being a source of inspiration, has been and is a source of confusion, bewilderment, and inefficiency. . . . We believe that there is an essential unity among all Chinese Christians, and that we are voicing the sentiment of the whole Chinese Christian body in claiming that we have the desire and the possibility to effect a speedy realization of corporate unity, and in calling upon missionaries and representatives of the Churches in the West, through self-sacrificial devotion to our Lord, to remove all the obstacles in order that Christ's prayer for unity may be fulfilled in China."

Dr Lew went on to remind us that Christianity is being looked upon with grave suspicion at this moment in China, "because while it professes to teach love and unity, it is divided against itself. Some national leaders have pointedly asked, 'Can Christianity, which has caused and supported so many wars in Western history, which is at present minutely divided in its own household, be a factor of help to China at all in her present life-and-death struggle for national unity? Can one guarantee that Christianity, with all its divisions, will not be a constant irritating and dividing factor in the body politic of the new China?' Only a united Church can meet such a challenge."

These arguments and appeals from the Mission Field were relevant, naturally, to all the subjects handled by the Conference, but they have been set down at some length at this point partly because the subject of this chapter was the first to be taken up by the Conference, partly because this particular subject, the Church's Message to the World, does in a certain sense focus the whole question of unity. The opening papers and speeches, referred to above, gave the Section of the Conference which dealt with this subject plenty to think about. But, owing partly to the large measure of agreement already existing, and partly to the able guidance of this Section's chairman, Dr Deissmann, it was not found necessary, in this instance, to sub-divide into smaller groups, nor—after many hours of careful work by its drafting committee—did the Section find any great difficulty in agreeing on its report. And, as indicated at the beginning of this chapter, the whole Conference, with this Report placed in its hands, said in effect, and with complete unanimity, This is the Gospel which we are seeking to give to the world; however much we may differ on matters of Church Order, at least we are at one in the Message we would proclaim as that which alone answers the needs of sinning and suffering humanity.

The Report is as follows :—

The Church's Message to the World—the Gospel

We, Members of the World Conference on Faith and Order, met at Lausanne, August 3–21, 1927,

are agreed in offering the following statement to the several Churches as the message of the Church to the world:

(1) The message of the Church to the world is, and must always remain, in the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

(2) The Gospel is the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to sinful man in Jesus Christ.

(3) The world was prepared for the coming of Christ through the activities of God's Spirit in all humanity, but especially in His revelation as given in the Old Testament; and in the fulness of time the eternal Word of God became incarnate, and was made man, Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, full of grace and truth.

(4) Through His life and teaching, His call to repentance, His proclamation of the coming of the Kingdom of God and of judgment, His suffering and death, His resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of the Father, and by the mission of the Holy Spirit, He has brought to us forgiveness of sins, and has revealed the fulness of the living God, and His boundless love toward us. By the appeal of that love, shown in its completeness on the Cross, He summons us to the new life of faith, self-sacrifice, and devotion to His service and the service of men.

(5) Jesus Christ, as the crucified and the living One, as Saviour and Lord, is also the centre of the world-wide Gospel of the Apostles and the Church. Because He Himself is the Gospel, the Gospel is the message of the Church to the world. It is more than a philosophical theory; more than a

theological system; more than a programme for material betterment. The Gospel is rather the gift of a new world from God to this old world of sin and death; still more, it is the victory over sin and death, the revelation of eternal life in Him who has knit together the whole family in heaven and on earth in the communion of saints, united in the fellowship of service, of prayer, and of praise.

(6) The Gospel is the prophetic call to sinful man to turn to God, the joyful tidings of justification and of sanctification to those who believe in Christ. It is the comfort of those who suffer; to those who are bound it is the assurance of the glorious liberty of the sons of God. The Gospel brings peace and joy to the heart, and produces in men self-denial, readiness for brotherly service, and compassionate love. It offers the supreme goal for the aspirations of youth—strength to the toiler, rest to the weary, and the crown of life to the martyr.

(7) The Gospel is the sure source of power for social regeneration. It proclaims the only way by which humanity can escape from those class and race hatreds which devastate society at present, into the enjoyment of national well-being and international friendship and peace. It is also a gracious invitation to the non-Christian world, East and West, to enter into the joy of the living Lord.

(8) Sympathizing with the anguish of our generation, with its longing for intellectual sincerity, social justice, and spiritual inspiration, the Church in the eternal Gospel meets the needs and fulfils the God-given aspirations of the modern

world. Consequently, as in the past, so also in the present, the Gospel is the only way of salvation. Thus, through His Church, the living Christ still says to men, "Come unto Me! . . . He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life."

NOTE.—In reporting this section's work I should like to acknowledge the assistance of Archdeacon F. B. Macnutt of Leicester.

IV

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

Extremes were always meeting at Lausanne. And the odd thing was that when they met, they generally found each other quite likeable, and discovered that there was really a good deal more in the opposite point of view than they had ever realized before.

They certainly seemed to meet in the papers, if not in the persons, of the two main speakers on the morning of Friday, 5th August, when the Conference set to work, in an admirable frame of mind, to tackle one of its stiffest subjects, "The Nature of the Church." The first paper was written by his Holiness, Metropolitan Chrysostom of Athens, and read, in the Metropolitan's absence, by Dr Hamilcar Alivisatos of the University of Athens. After a very friendly greeting, in which the Metropolitan described the Church of Greece as "gladly accepting the call to unity," and "wholeheartedly desiring Christian fellowship and mutual goodwill," the paper went on to state, quite frankly, the Eastern Orthodox doctrine of the Nature of the Church. The writer outlined what he felt to be the particular marks of the true Church, and then proceeded to indicate that, in the view of the Orthodox Church, that Church—holy, Apostolic, infallible—is assuredly distinguished

by those marks. Other Christians of other Christian Churches, as they sat and listened to that paper, may have felt that if all conceptions of the Church were to be as rigid and uncompromising as this, Reunion must be some way off. But they remembered that until quite recently, the Orthodox Church had had very little contact with the life and work of other communions, and that any statements by its leaders must of necessity reflect something of their centuries of isolation. Moreover, it was a feature of Lausanne that no one was expected or desired to water down his own beliefs; let us, said the Conference in effect, get all our diverse views expressed, our various cards laid on the table, and then see what we can make of them all.

So we were provided with an arrestingly complete contrast when the Orthodox patriarch was succeeded, immediately, by the Rev. S. Parkes Cadman of New York City, President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and Pastor of Brooklyn Congregational Church, who, through his radio talks and press articles, is said to reach the largest audience in America, if not the world. Dr Cadman, a modern to his finger-tips, was elastic, broad, tolerant, inclusive, where the other had been stiff and unyielding. He saw marks of the Church wherever he looked. "As I interpret the past of the Church Universal, few if any of her priesthoods or prophetic orders, her sacramental or evangelical theologies, her various concepts of holiness or oneness, have failed to confer lasting religious benefits on mankind. If that past has any lessons of

unity or plans for its advancement to unfold to us, we shall do well to embrace them for the furtherance of the Gospel." And as if unconsciously illustrating how a completely *orthodox* and *right-thinking* Church must not leave out bits of truth, he went on to emphasize some other things, integral to New Testament Christianity, which the Church view of his Eastern brother seemed somehow to have left out. "The test of the true Church," he urged, "is not conformity to type, but effectiveness in fulfilling the will of her Lord, and therefore that organisation need not be of a single type. . . . Christians cannot afford to hold lightly or neglect any aids and expedients for the welfare of the Church Catholic and of humanity. But aids and expedients should not be elevated as part of the essence of God's message to man in the Gospel, nor allowed to obscure the ideal of Christ in His Ecclesia. The exaltation of means into ends, and the ascription of changeless merits to subordinate things are the gravest obstacles to unity we encounter." After expressing an eloquent hope that the Conference might be able, guided by the Spirit, to "bridge the gulf between freedom and authority," the speaker pleaded earnestly for a clear-sighted recognition of the rich variety of the Spirit's work, and warned us of the danger of what might be termed "monopolist" views of Christ's Society. "The reciprocal gifts of this Conference should confirm the truth that the Church has wrought successfully under diverse forms and policies. It should teach us that those who refuse to consider any other system than their own, labour under the mistaken impression that

the Spirit abandoned His mission when their particular system was evolved. It should show us that Catholicity becomes sectarian when imprisoned within the frontiers of any single form of Church development. It should enforce afresh the lesson that God has been pleased to reveal Himself in sundry times and divers manners, ever old and ever new, the new being but an expansion of the old, and both a continuance of His redemptive purpose. It should lead us to those serene heights where hard and fast lines of system melt without change of creed, while spirituality and charity attain their native universality."

These striking papers were followed by some interesting shorter speeches. The Bishop of Manchester (Dr William Temple), with his incomparable lucidity of thought and equally incomparable lucidity of statement, helped us all to think straight on an intricate and difficult subject, and with his unerring instinct for the essential, saved us from that common form of blindness which cannot see the wood for the trees. He reminded us how Christ brought to man a " new kind of fellowship, in which, while distinction of gift and function remain, *division*, either as separation or antagonism, is abolished. ' There is neither Jew nor Gentile '—the deepest of all divisions based on religious history overcome ; ' there is neither Greek nor barbarian '—the deepest of all cultural divisions overcome ; ' there is neither bond nor free '—the deepest of all social and economic divisions overcome ; ' there is neither male nor female '—the deepest of all human divisions overcome. [I have, of course, conflated the passages in Galatians and

Colossians.] What, then, is the secret? It is that 'Christ is all and in all' so completely that in place of all those divided groups there is 'one man in Christ Jesus'—all men and women who are members of His Church, so utterly possessed by His Spirit, that in a true sense they constitute one Person, and that Person Christ. Here is a glorious corollary of the Lord's own promise that where two or three are gathered together in His name, there should be found not merely a crowd or a group in the technical psychological sense, transcending the sum of its individual units as such a crowd or group always does, but there should be found the Lord in Person." But this new-found unity, he pointed out, was not meant to be "rigid or inelastic; still less that it should express itself in uniformity. Nothing could more effectively ensure its future disruption than that." Nor is the Church just a flabby society to include any persons of goodwill. Its unity is too miraculous for that. "The unity we seek is a unity which effectively binds together in fellowship those who by nature tend to be at variance. It did not need Incarnate God to tell men to love their friends; we have not learnt yet how to obey His command to love our enemies. It is no miracle of grace when Evangelicals worship together in harmony, or when Catholics do the same. Differences of organization, based on differences of temperament, of taste, or tradition, are real offences against the purpose for which the Church exists: they stereotype the very divisions which the Church exists to overcome. A unity which was a mere federation of such elements would seem to me to have betrayed the

cause for which alone that unity is truly desirable. A society built on this kind of unity is God-given, not man-made. No conception of the 'Nature of the Church' is historically adequate if it fails to recognize the indubitable fact that the early Church shows no recollection of any moment when Disciples of the Church met together to constitute the Church as an organized society. In germ its organization was there from the outset. It is not a human contrivance. It is the continuation of that divine intrusion into human history which we call the Incarnation."

The point was driven right home by the next speaker, the Rev. H. B. Workman of the Wesleyan Methodist Conference, well known as a student of mediæval history; and he reminded us too that this God-given society is a *living thing*. "The Church is neither a loose envelope nor a skin that in some vague way wraps round its members, nor is the Church the sum of its members—whether the *militia Christi* or the *Universitas Viatorum*, 'the guild of travellers'—ideas that we find emerging at different times; much less is the Church the guild of its ministers, nor is it primarily the instrument for the profession of a faith. The Church is a living organism with a life comparable to that of any other organism in its laws of growth and retardation, only grander, richer, fuller—for it is an organism instinct with the divine life, and with an oversoul in which we can find the working of the Holy Spirit Himself."

To listen and attend to such speeches as those from which extracts have been given, and two others, in German and French respectively, by

Bishop Raffay, of the Lutheran Church of Hungary, and Professor Menegoz, of Alsace-Lorraine, was a good morning's work on a warm summer's day. And the afternoon was hotter still. The sun blazed down through the wide windows into the *aula* where we met, and delegates looked rather limp—though there had been a noticeable shedding of stiff black ecclesiastical garb in favour of light summer suits! But despite the heat the attendance was not perceptibly thinner, nor did attention flag. The rich variety in the personalities of the speakers, as well as in what they said, always saved the Conference from getting bogged in the slough of mere dulness. Pastor Siegmund Schultze, an honoured leader from the Protestant Churches of Germany, warned us against stumbling over that irritating obstacle a false antithesis, showing that the conceptions of the Church as a divine foundation and as a human society are not necessarily antithetical. Metropolitan Stephan of Sofia reiterated, somewhat heavily, the Eastern Orthodox point of view. Dr Yoichiyo Inogaki called us again to the stubborn realities of the Mission Field, and bore witness that the United Church in Japan (the *Nippon-Sei-Kokwai*) had found, not in theory but in practice, that the twin Church principles of continuity and adaptation are not mutually exclusive. Another view from the Mission Field, that of Canon F. J. Western of Lahore Cathedral, expressed the need, and pictured the possibility, of a Church exercising real authority both as to teaching and to discipline—such authority as can only attach to a *united* Church. And then came one of the several welcome interventions, usually in

a quite brief little speech, from one who justly carries enormous weight in the counsels of Christendom as he did with the Conference, Bishop Gore. Whenever that spare, frail figure rose from the front bench and stood up before the Conference with folded arms, all the delegates leant forward to catch the quiet incisive tones. On this occasion the Bishop got up—so he told us—to recall the Conference to the magnitude and greatness of our ideal. He bade us see the width, the spaciousness, the comprehensiveness of any complete Reunion in the Christian Church Universal. "We believe," he said, "that there is something in Catholicism as it is represented in the various existing Churches and something in Protestantism as it is represented in the various Churches, which is deficient: that you have not here the embodiment of two antagonistic ideas, but that there is that in which each demands the other. That, I suppose, is the root motive of our magnificent and apparently impracticable ideal. It is yet that impracticable thing which we feel to be in the purpose of God."

And so the ground was prepared, and very thoroughly prepared, for the work of that section of the Conference which now applied itself to some really close study of the subject, with a view to formulating a Report for the whole Conference to consider. "What a tremendous task," records one[1] who was closely identified with the work of this section, "was set before the members of our Commission! When one sits down to think out the extraordinary difficulties of the adventure upon which that Commission was sent, one is filled with

[1] Rev. H. N. Baker, Church of England in Australia.

wonder that any result was achieved which was worth anything at all. Take a mental run over the vast variety of the views about the nature of the Church existing to-day; remember that these views vary with regard to the past, the present, and the future of the Church, as also with regard to its constitution, membership, and significance; take into account the fact that most of the obstacles to Reunion arise out of differences of organization, and that these differences are maintained with a great strength of feeling; then think of the effort of a small body of men in attempting to come to an agreed statement on this momentous subject within the space of two days! And perhaps some conception of the stupendous difficulty of the task will dawn upon the mind."

The difficulties inherent in the task itself, however, were not the only ones which faced the members of the Commission. There was another difficulty, more elementary and practical, but very hard to surmount. It was the difficulty of getting a heterogeneous, diverse collection of men to think together at all. "Try to imagine what kind of body we were. We comprised 11 members of the Greek Orthodox Church, 21 Anglicans, 6 Free-churchmen (2 Baptists, 2 Disciples, 2 Friends), 15 Lutherans, 28 Presbyterians and members of Continental Reformed Churches, 15 Methodists and members of the Evangelical Church of Germany. Was it possible for us to bring our minds into fellowship of effort? This initial psychological difficulty was enough to wreck the endeavour from the start. The group never formed a united team: its members did not have

time to be broken into one another's mental habits. At first they pulled in all directions of the compass, and the harder they pulled, the worse the tangle! It was not will that was needed, but direction. It was extraordinarily interesting to watch a gradual approximation to team method grow up between us. Indeed the whole Conference has provided a signal instance of this psychological process."

"We assembled," continues the recorder of this section, "on the morning of Monday, 8th August, in the Church of St Laurent, a body comprising 122 members. Our chairman was Professor W. Adams Brown of New York. Proceedings began with prayer, and then our chairman gave his opening address. He had evidently realized the difficulty of getting us to work as a team, and he suggested that we might be helped in our task if we should give a period to listening to addresses by selected speakers representing the more important points of view. In his own address he gave us an aim, but not quite enough direction, and it was an aim which rather tended to divide us. For the implication of the address was to the effect that we were to formulate conditions of the union of the Churches; and so far as it did that, it tended to put us on the wrong track.

"The Bishop of Bombay made a great attempt to put us right. He said definitely—and his plea was entirely in line with the declared objective of the whole Conference—that we were not there to formulate unity. We were 'not plenipotentiaries negotiating a treaty, but responsible students of the truth of God.' We were not to attempt 'a formula of concord, but a declaration of truth.'

We must be realists and face hard facts both of history and of existing circumstances, and were not to be consumed with a desire to be pleasant to one another. After making this clear statement as to our aim and object, he said a few words as to the spirit in which we were to pursue it. He lifted us on to a higher level. He said, 'We must look at the whole Church from above, not from within our own section. Try to see the whole separated Church as it now is, through God's eyes, not our own.' It was a great address, but perhaps some of us were not ready to take it in.

"Then followed speeches from other leaders which covered a vast range of points of view, stretching from that of the Greek Orthodox Church on the one side to that of the Quakers on the other. We were made to see that some of our members laid special emphasis upon the visible unity of the Church, while others regarded it as being purely a matter of the Spirit, any visible organization being of quite secondary value. Intermediate between these views were others which set forth unity as being at once visible and invisible; but again these views were found to differ between themselves, as the stress of importance was laid upon one or another of these two aspects.

"The effect of these speeches was to deepen our confusion. If our task was to formulate unity, how was it possible to bring such mutually opposing views into any kind of harmony? Bishop Parsons of America made a great effort to draw us together. He said that we were given truth on one side, as set against truth on the other. On the mental plane no unity could be found. How then could

it be attained? Only by the wonderful sublimating power of love. Yet we felt, inevitably, that love alone could not effect it: the mind was required to do its part as well.

"The next stage was to divide ourselves into five small groupings, each comprising about twenty members. So please picture these little committees meeting together in different rooms and different churches in various parts of Lausanne. It was in the committees that the best work of the Conference was performed, because in them the work of our self-education proceeded.

"What we failed to learn from speeches (such as that of the Bishop of Bombay) we learned through experience in mutual exchange of views in these small gatherings. Let it be remembered that up to this stage there had been no real conference. All that we had done was to listen to speeches: we had not expressed ourselves or set ourselves to any practical task. Now at last we embarked upon a salutary process of learning and unlearning—and we needed to unlearn not a few of the misconceptions which we ourselves had brought to the Conference. So on Tuesday morning, 9th August, the real work began which had brought us together from the ends of the earth. These small committees were the very things to help us in this task of discovery and mutual enlightenment; for in them every one had opportunity to take part in conversational discussion.

"Gradually we came to see one or two things. First, we realized that an almost impassable chasm separated the mentality of people born and bred in the Catholic tradition from those born and bred

in the Evangelical tradition. It seems impossibly difficult for the one to get even in true sight of the other. This was one of the 'hard facts' of which we had to take account. In our groups were members of the Greek Orthodox Church and a few Anglo-Catholics who represented the Catholic tradition, and they were a valuable help to us. It took a good deal of time for another group to realize that this development of Christianity must find expression as accurate and as full as possible in the Report: one at least of the sub-committees tended to overlook the Greeks and Catholics and to contemplate a vague neutral statement which would really be of very little value. We came to see that our statement would have to be such as would include both the Catholics and the Quakers, and not be a mere colourless product of intermediate groups. It followed that we could not aim at formulating unity as yet: we must begin by registering differences—our education was developing!

"There were five of these sub-committees, and their chairmen were respectively: Dr Cadman, Dr Workman, General Superintendent Scherer, Dr Alivisatos, and Dr d'Aubigné. It was proposed that each of these groups should draw up its own report; and that the five reports were then to be submitted to a Drafting Committee elected by the whole section, which would comprise all points of view in its membership. By this committee the reports would be correlated into one document, which would then be submitted to the whole section for further debate and discussion. This plan worked excellently.

"Let us look into one of these groups, that presided over by Dr Cadman. It met in a subterranean room under the Church of St Laurent, where it enjoyed a quiet spot for its discussions. After some debate a decision was arrived at, to follow a line of suggestions and questions as to the Nature of the Church which had been drawn up by the Subjects Committee in preparation for the Conference. This pamphlet proved invaluable as a basis for discussion. Along with it use was made of a report issued by the Lambeth Conference of Anglicans and Free Churchmen, which took place a few years ago. We had not proceeded very far when we began to find our obstacles. The first of these arose over the question as to whether the Church is based upon Holy Scripture or whether upon Tradition in addition to Scripture. This difference opened up the divergence between the Greek Orthodox position and that of most of the other members of the Committee. We came to see that both points of view would have to come into our Report. At the end of the morning we succeeded in drawing up our Report (not entirely satisfactory perhaps to any of us) along the lines suggested by the Subjects Committee. This report accordingly was sent into the Drafting Committee along with the other four.

"On Wednesday morning we met again as a whole section to face this composite document. The whole of this day was spent in criticizing, amending, deleting from, and adding to it. The process of self-education was going on the whole time. The changes which were agreed upon were handed to the Drafting Committee to be incor-

porated into the document which then would form our Report to the whole Conference.

"The following afternoon this Report was duly presented to the Conference by our chairman, Dr Adams Brown. It was most interesting to compare the speech which he then delivered with his opening speech, delivered in the Church of St Laurent at the very beginning of the work of our section. It was clear that our chairman had been going through a process of education as well as ourselves. Now he took full account of differences and difficulties. He spoke of the determination, 'frankly, honestly and generously to face any fundamental differences.' And so the debate was launched upon the wider sea of the General Conference. How did the Report fare? It stood the test very well. Hardly any material alteration was made in it. Its subject-matter was rearranged; and the points of difference between Christians were expanded and appended as notes at the end of its text. The final Report, as received by the Conference, runs as follows:—

"We, MEMBERS of the Conference on Faith and Order, are glad to report that we have been able to arrive at substantial accord in the following statement of our points of agreement and difference.

"I. God, who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world, has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. The Church of the Living God is constituted by His own will, not by the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or as societies, though He uses the will of men as His instrument.

Of this Church Jesus Christ is the Head, the Holy Spirit its continuing life.

" II. The Church as the communion of believers in Christ Jesus is, according to the New Testament, the people of the New Covenant; the Body of Christ; and the Temple of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.

" III. The Church is God's chosen instrument by which Christ, through the Holy Spirit, reconciles men to God through faith, bringing their wills into subjection to His sovereignty, sanctifying them through the means of grace, and uniting them in love and service to be His witnesses and fellow-workers in the extension of His rule on earth until His Kingdom come in glory.

" IV. As there is but one Christ, and one Life in Him, and one Holy Spirit who guides into all truth, so there is and can be but one Church, holy, catholic, and apostolic.

" V. The Church on earth possesses certain characteristics whereby it can be known of men. These have been, since the days of the Apostles, at least the following:

" (1) The possession and acknowledgment of the Word of God as given in Holy Scripture and interpreted by the Holy Spirit to the Church and to the individual (*a*).

" (2) The profession of faith in God as He is incarnate and revealed in Christ.

" (3) The acceptance of Christ's commission to preach the Gospel to every creature.

" (4) The observance of the Sacraments.

" (5) A ministry for the pastoral office, the

preaching of the Word, and the administration of the Sacraments.

"(6) A fellowship in prayer, in worship, in all the means of grace, in the pursuit of holiness, and in the service of man.

"VI. As to the extent and manner in which the Church thus described finds expression in the existing Churches, we differ. Our differences chiefly concern:

"1. The nature of the Church visible and the Church invisible, their relation to each other, and the number of those who are included in each (*b*).

"2. The significance of our divisions, past and present (*c*).

"Whatever our views on these points, we are convinced that it is the will of Christ that the one life of the one body should be manifest to the world. To commend the Gospel to doubting, sinful, and bewildered men, a united witness is necessary. We therefore urge most earnestly that all Christians, in fulfilment of our Saviour's prayer that His disciples may be one, reconsecrate themselves to God, that by the help of His Spirit, the body of Christ may be built up, its members united in faith and love, and existing obstacles to the manifestation of their unity in Christ may be removed; that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him.

"We join in the prayer that the time may be hastened when in the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

NOTES

(*a*) Some hold that this interpretation is given through the tradition of the Church; others through the immediate witness of the Spirit to the heart and conscience of the believers; others through both combined.

(*b*) For instance—

1. Some hold that the invisible Church is wholly in heaven; others include in it all true believers on earth, whether contained in any organization or not.

2. Some hold that the visible expression of the Church was determined by Christ Himself, and is therefore unchangeable; others that the one Church under the guidance of the Holy Spirit may express itself in varying forms.

3. Some hold that one or other of the existing Churches is the only true Church; others that the Church, as we have described it, is to be found in some or all of the existing communions taken together.

4. Some, while recognizing other Christian bodies as Churches, are persuaded that in the providence of God and by the teaching of history, a particular form of ministry has been shown to be necessary to the best welfare of the Church; others hold that no one form of organization is inherently preferable; still others, that no organization is necessary.

(*c*) One view is that no division of Christendom has ever come to pass without sin. Another view is that the divisions were the inevitable outcome of different gifts of the Spirit and different understandings of the truth. Between these, there is the view of those who look back on the divisions of the past with penitence and sorrow, coupled with a lively sense of God's mercy, which, in spite of and even through these divisions, has advanced His cause in the world.

V

A COMMON FAITH

THERE were many at Lausanne who believed strongly enough in the authority of the Church, but the general temper of the Conference was by no means such as to regard the creeds and their use as being above discussion. Indeed the frank and sincere willingness to face the whole question of the creeds, and even to recognize that, as the Subjects Committee's material had suggested, the Church might one day seek for other forms to express its faith in accordance with future needs, was one more proof of the deep reality that characterized the Lausanne proceedings. And, after all, the Lausanne delegates were, for the most part, thoughtful men who were unlikely to hold childish views about creeds, or to fall into the silly mistake of separating "dogma" from the corporate experience of which it is only the token and the symbol.

Again, the Conference was fortunate in those who were entrusted with the important task of saying the first words and marking out the general line of thought. Bishop Gore, with the great weight of thought and scholarship which he always carried, went straight to the heart of the problem. Despite the disposition manifested in certain quarters to-day to deny the continuity between St Paul and Jesus of Nazareth, he claimed—a claim which most

Christians and Christian Churches would surely uphold—that in fact, the spiritual experience in the New Testament, from Christ's first disciples to those who a generation later knew Him only "in the spirit," was a continuous, living, identical thing; and, further, that from this faith of the New Testament the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds were the natural and logical inferences. If, he said, we, the different Churches, have any real agreement on this point, then we can go forward in our great Reunion enterprise. If not, we shall have to content ourselves just with co-operation in certain limited spheres of religious activity. But the summary and the conclusions of his argument must be given in his own words. "We are brought here together," he said, "to seek the path of Reunion. Reunion in any large sense means the bringing together of Catholic and Protestant. Perhaps we are all agreed in feeling that the Catholic Church needs the contribution of the Protestant Churches and movements, and the Protestant Churches and movements need the strength and spirit of Catholicism. We must be very patient with one another after these long centuries of alienation. But if we are to make any progress at all, we must start from some fundamental agreement on central ideas. Are we agreed that the Church, which is Christ's organ in the world, is meant to be a coherent body, based on a belief in a positive and final revelation of God, made in and through Jesus Christ, which it is its constant business to carry into all the world as the message of God for man's salvation? Again, are we agreed that the doctrine of St Paul and St John, given

under the inspiration of the Spirit of Christ, is the true expression of His Mind for men? If so, we belong to the religion of authority. If so, the Church stands before the world as professing a common creed which is accepted as the Word of God. . . . If here and now we are agreed in accepting the creeds as authoritative statements of the common faith, we can perhaps leave the abstract question of the necessary finality of the formulas for future discussion. We shall have accepted the principle that the thing to be expressed, in the future as in the present must be, not a different faith from the faith of the New Testament, but the same.

"The question then for us to-day is whether we are prepared to accept the creeds as adequately representing the apostolic faith and that apostolic message as really the message of Jesus and 'the Word.' If so, we can go forward in our large enterprise. If not, we can go forward in certain large districts of the field. There could be reunion among large sections of the Protestant world, or again, perhaps, reunion between the Orthodox and the Anglican Churches. But any reunion between Catholic and Protestant in a large sense is inconceivable except on the basis of acceptance in common of the creeds as authoritative statements of the Faith in Christ."

Bishop Gore was followed by General Superintendent Dr Zoellner, of the Protestant Churches of Germany. He agreed with the Bishop that it would be inadvisable, at any rate in this generation, to attempt to discard the old creeds and adopt new ones. After an interesting passage in which

he traced the genesis of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds—" the one is the folk-song of the people of God, the other the product of the conscious art of its theologians "—he went on to emphasize the fact that these two creeds are the common heritage of the severed Churches. And the Evangelical Churches of Germany, he told the Conference, have held fast, through a lengthy period of critical theology, to the Apostles' Creed; it has maintained its place unshaken in their liturgies and ordinances, in Baptism and Ordination. No road to Reunion, he added, can evade the question of credal confession. " Its creed is the inmost expression which any Church can give to its life: and therefore nothing can truly help us forward unless it grows out of what is thus most inward, and grows out of it through that power of the Spirit from above which leads us ever onward into the fundamental depths of the word of revelation. It follows from this, again, that no inward union can be really promoted by the construction of artificial formulæ. Such formulæ are like a piece of paper stuck over a crack in a wall, which may hide the crack for a while, but cannot repair it."

Some good points were made in the discussion that followed. Dr Lindskog (Church of Sweden) stressed the supreme importance of a real unity in spirit as distinct from intellectual or doctrinal agreement; he felt that the exaltation of doctrine at the expense of the plain teaching of Jesus contributes to that intellectualism which, in his view, had done more than anything else to divide the Churches. Lord Sands, speaking as a Scotch Presbyterian, found himself in general agreement with

Bishop Gore and Dr Zoellner, as to the value set by Christendom on the ancient creeds; but, while deprecating any attempt to rewrite the creeds, the speaker indicated his desire to see some "supplementary declaration," in the language of Scripture, for the sake of "those who, whilst loyal to the creeds as statements of doctrine, find that they do not wholly satisfy their evangelical and activist impulses." But the most constructive contribution to the debate came from the Bishop of Gloucester, Dr A. C. Headlam, whose great learning, wide knowledge of all that pertains to Reunion, and resourcefulness in practical suggestions, made him at this juncture, and throughout, a big asset to the Conference. The Bishop said he thought that, after the morning's speeches, the time had come for some one to be so bold as to try and express in some concrete way the agreement that was becoming apparent; and then he proceeded to read out this formula as a suggested common Confession of Faith with some comments: "We accept the faith of Christ as it has been taught us by the Holy Scriptures, and as it has been handed down to us in the creed of the Catholic Church, set forth at the Council of Chalcedon, and in the Apostles' Creed."

"Those words," added the Bishop, "have been very carefully chosen, and I will broadly expound them.

"First of all, we accept the faith of Christ, we do not accept the creed. We accept the creed as the expression of the faith of Christ, and it is very important that we should say that what we are united upon is the faith of Christ, because though

it may be well expressed by the creed, it is far deeper, broader, and fuller than any creed can express.

"We put in the forefront the Holy Scriptures as the source of our knowledge of the faith of Christ, and on that we are all agreed.

"We accept the great Œcumenical creed, which is the almost universal authority of the ancient world, which is agreed upon by East and West, which is accepted by almost all the modern Churches, and it is the only possible basis of union.

"I would add to that, perhaps, the Apostles' Creed as being a simpler expression of the same thing.

"The great value of putting the formula in that way is this: there are some who fear the ancient Creed because they think it commits them to a philosophy they do not hold. We do not therefore accept the creed, we accept the faith which is taught in the creed, of which it is the accepted expression.

"I venture to think that on those words it may be possible for us to unite with the great majority (at any rate) of the Churches. May I say that I do not think, perhaps, that all the professors will unite; I have been a professor myself and have been associated with them all my life, and I do not think that you would ever get all the professors to unite.

"There is one thing more. The same Council of Chalcedon which promulgated the creed which we accept anathematized also those who put forward any other creed or who added to the creed. My own belief is that almost all the divisions of

Christendom have arisen because people have neglected that side of the wisdom of the ancient Churches. It began with the *filioque* clause; it went on with the doctrine of transubstantiation. It ran riot at the Reformation, when every Church tried to redefine the creed so minutely as to exclude almost every one from its walls.

"Unless we are prepared to say that there will be no other necessary condition of union with the Christian Church than the creed of Christendom, we shall fall into exactly the same difficulties in the future as in the past, and this must apply, I am afraid, to the suggestion made by Lord Sands. We cannot pick out any particular expressions of Scripture because they happen to be the ones we like; we build ourselves on the faith of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, and the expression of the faith in the Œcumenical creeds."

There was a buzz of intent and animated conversation on the Bishop's proposals as members of the Conference trooped away to *déjeuner* in their hotels, and the members of the Creeds Section felt they had been given an interesting and substantial addition to the material which their group would have to digest. But before the section began its work, they were to hear that afternoon, in full Conference session, two more utterances which they would need to take into consideration, and which must have brief mention here. One was by the Bishop of Nubia, who, emphasizing the pre-eminent place held among the Orthodox by the Nicene Creed, intimated that he and his Church regarded that creed as the "rock-like foundation of any future Reunion." He went on to make

the very remarkable admission that "the Holy Spirit leading the Church into all truth may enable the future United Church in another Œcumenical Synod to dictate also another creed, in accordance with the Holy Creed and the holy tradition, for the needs of modern times." The other noteworthy utterance came from an eminent English Nonconformist leader, a man of keen mind and large soul, Dr Vernon Bartlett, of Mansfield College, Oxford. Making what he called, and justly, "a gesture from those who are primarily Evangelicals, but who are in a very deep sense also Catholic and universal in their outlook," Dr Bartlett indicated that he and his friends were able to go a good long way with Bishop Gore and those who approached the question from the side of Catholic tradition. He began by expressing the desire that he and those associated with him might be allowed to "maintain that type of personal creed which expresses the attitude of personality to the personality of Jesus Christ as the fundamental bond in Christian life and Christian society."

"Standing here," the speaker continued, "as I do in the city of Alexandre Vinet, I think many of you will understand what I mean when I refer to that classic discourse of his in which he defines faith as a steadfast, childlike gaze (*le regard*) whereby the object—Jesus Christ—passes into the very substance of the soul of believers. To that conception of faith we are deeply attached.

"We believe that is the fundamental conviction —that the personality of Jesus Christ is the appeal of God manifest in the flesh to human personality, and creates the unique attitude to a unique person-

ality, upon which I believe the Christian Church is founded."

But the speaker went on to show that he realized that this attitude towards the faith and creed does not cover all the ground. "There are those who preach faith in Christ from the more purely objective point of view; they approach it from the point of view not of the direct and immediate impression, but from the point of view of those inferential safeguards which the Church in the early days found itself led to draw up against certain specific forms of misinterpretation. I entirely agree therefore with Bishop Gore's view, as I understand it, of the historic creeds, namely, that their intention is primarily a negative one, *i.e.* to exclude everything that denies the reality of the divine nature of Christ or His human nature, or tends to fail to bring them into personal unity, or to confuse the two. In that sense we accept the tradition of the historic creeds; we accept their substance or essential meaning, we accept the lines they have defined for us, within which the interpretation of the personality of Christ shall be developed, but we are not prepared to substitute what we consider that more indirect, abstract and secondary form of the expression of Christian faith as the relation of moral personality to the personality of Jesus Christ, to substitute it as the primary expression of Christian faith. We are prepared to make that the secondary safeguard in order to define it, but we still prefer to put into the forefront of our teaching and of our Church life and of our appeal to man the more personal expression of faith.

"I very much hope that some form of common expression of that religous aspect of faith—what I call the faith of the Gospel as distinct from the faith of the historical creeds in their special form—may be reached, so that we may not only be at one when we sing, but that we may be able to find some other form of expression in which we can utter our common consciousness."

Once again, the full significance of the agreed Report ultimately approved by the Conference will be the better appreciated by readers of this book if some attempt is made to enable them to look through the window, so to speak, while the section is at work and to observe the round-the-table efforts that had to be made before anything like unity could be attained. The section was entrusted to the leadership of Dr Tissington Tatlow. It consisted of about 120 persons, two of whom were women, and was representative of all the elements in the Conference. Here is his own account of how he organized the section, and of the way the work was done.

"I came to the conclusion that as the time at our disposal was ridiculously short for a great subject, it would be foolish to spend a lot of time on encouraging 120 of the most talkative people in the world—for everyone at the Conference was a leader and accustomed to talk!—to discuss the best kind of machinery to set up. I invited Dr Ross Stevenson of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America to take the chair at full meetings of the section, and under his expert guidance we got going at once on a general discussion. It became clear very quickly that

there were a very limited number of main issues—(*a*) There was a group determined that adequate recognition be accorded to the Bible in any statement made, (*b*) there was a group who were determined that a tribute should be paid to the necessity of personal religion, (*c*) a group unaccustomed to the use of creeds and confessions of faith and inclined to think them dangerous and divisive, and (*d*) a group who were accustomed to set a very high value upon creeds.

"These groups were most of them of a composite character, *e.g.*, the group anxious to lay stress on personal religion contained Lutherans, Anglo-Catholics, English Free Churchmen, and American Protestants. Similarly, the group keen on creeds and confessions contained Othodox, Lutherans, Anglicans, and American Presbyterians. At this first session there was an incident which, I think, helped us a good deal: one of our number wanted to make a speech for which the chairman doubted whether there would be time; the speaker feared that he was not going to get his opportunity and his face showed signs of a rising storm. It was at once, however, pointed out to the group that we were going to try and achieve general assent, not to deprive anybody who had a genuine conviction of an opportunity of expressing it, and that no one need be nervous lest minority points of view would be overridden, and the man who wanted to speak was invited to say all that was in his heart to the section. The result was no storm, but a rising spirit of understanding and goodwill.

"An hour and a half's general discussion made it plain that there were many people who wanted to

speak, and most of them wanted to cover very much the same ground, though approaching it from different angles. It was decided, therefore, that we should break up into five groups with the following group leaders: Dr Ashworth (a Baptist from the United States of America), Canon Quick (of the Church of England), the Rev. Paul Sandegren (a Lutheran from the Swedish Church), Professor Choisy (of the Reformed Church in Switzerland), and Dr Hermelink (a German Protestant).

"The five groups met the same afternoon and Dr Stevenson and I met with the leaders when they had finished to compare notes. We found the groups were all working on much the same lines, and the leaders were instructed each to continue separate sessions of their groups the following morning and to bring the results of their work at lunch time. Four of the groups produced the reports by this hour. Some copies of these were typed, and the whole section called together to discuss them in the afternoon. It was found that the reports were all on much the same lines and, after general discussion, we created a committee which the section was prepared to regard as representative, to take the reports during the evening and make one document. The committee consisted of the group leaders, Dr Stevenson, myself, and additional members appointed by the several groups. It met the same evening for three hours. The Bishop of Gloucester was at once invited to chair us, and we proceeded to compile a single document from the five that were in our hands. All the members of the committee took part freely

in the discussion; most were valuable in their suggestions. There was a spirit of most delightful camaraderie, and the Bishop of Gloucester made an excellent chairman, just the kind of one needed for the occasion, good-humoured and bluntly determined to get the work done. I triumphantly carried the result of the evening's work at about 1 a.m. to be typed. Next morning the section met and discussed this document. It was approved with two dissentients, and was ultimately presented to the Conference. During the period of delay before its actual presentation, it became known to me that the German element, especially the Lutherans, were not happy about the phrasing of some parts of it, and that the Greek Orthodox Delegation which had discussed it fully did not like the phrasing of other parts. I spent a good deal of time, and the Bishop of Gloucester did the same, in talking to different people with a view to finding out whether there was any fundamental cleavage or whether it was a question of phrasing, and we came to the conclusion that if another meeting of the committee was held, a version of the report could probably be prepared that would satisfy all elements. Accordingly, after the report had been presented to the Conference and many suggestions had been made, a second meeting of the committee of the section was called and, after a very friendly and talkative evening together, a document was produced which secured the full consent of all present."

This somewhat detailed account of the section's work will show what can be achieved when there is careful organization, wise leadership, and the

will to unity. And each section being a microcosm of the whole Conference, their work, properly done, should reflect the mind of the Conference. This was pre-eminently so in this instance. When finally the Report came up for "third reading" it was passed in the record time of five minutes!

The Church's Common Confession of Faith

We, Members of the Conference on Faith and Order, coming from all parts of the world in the interest of Christian Unity, have with deep gratitude to God found ourselves united in common prayer, in God our heavenly Father and His Son Jesus Christ, our Saviour, in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit.

Notwithstanding the difference in doctrine among us, we are united in a common Christian Faith which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the Œcumenical creed, commonly called the Nicene, and in the Apostles' Creed, which Faith is continuously confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ.

We believe that the Holy Spirit in leading the Church into all truth, may enable it, while firmly adhering to the witness of these Creeds (our common heritage from the ancient Church), to express the truths of revelation in such other forms as new problems may from time to time demand.

Finally, we desire to leave on record our solemn and unanimous testimony that no external and

written standards can suffice without an inward and personal experience of union with God in Christ."

NOTES

1. It must be noted that the Orthodox Eastern Church can accept the Nicene Creed only in its uninterpolated form without the *filioque* clause; and that although the Apostles' Creed has no place in the formularies of this Church, it is in accordance with its teaching.

2. It must be noted also that some of the Churches represented in this Conference conjoin tradition with the Scriptures, some are explicit in subordinating creeds to the Scriptures, some attach a primary importance to their particular Confessions, and some make no use of creeds.

3. It is understood that the use of these creeds will be determined by the competent authority in each Church, and that the several Churches will continue to make use of such special Confessions as they possess.

VI

AMBASSADORS FOR CHRIST

It was a remarkable thing—perhaps it was the result of the prayer going up for us all over the world—that the Conference did not become jaded. I do not recall a single occasion, either in full session or in sections, when members lost grip on the subject in hand because they were tired, or heated, or bored with each other and the whole thing. Body and nerves were kept from flagging for many, by occasional jaunts into the country or up the mountains—chiefly, it must be confessed, on Sunday afternoons, the only time when most of us could get free. And the soul of the Conference was daily refreshed by the morning devotions with which proceedings always began at 9.30, and which were, on the whole, well attended. These devotions would have been, for many of us, even more refreshing if we had been allowed less exhortation and more prayer, and, above all, more silent prayer. The value of our English ways of guided intercession, with plenty of silence, perhaps still awaits discovery in some other regions of Christendom.

This day, 12th August, found us nearing the half-way mark, and faced with perhaps the most thorny of all the subjects we were to take in hand, that of the Ministry. It must be confessed that it

was with bated breath that the Conference approached this part of its work. Here, it was felt, if anywhere, would come the breaking-point. Agreement beyond the expectation of the most sanguine had been reached in regard to the message of the Gospel, the creeds, and even in large measure as to the nature of the Church. But the Ministry was the crux of all the topics before the Conference. Could the one Spirit lead the one Body into agreement here? Or is there a limit to miracle? Let us envisage the issue.[1]

"It is no use to discount the topic of the Ministry as merely a matter of organization and therefore unimportant. The Ministry serves a far higher function than its administrative usefulness. But even as part of the machinery of organization it lies at the very centre of our divisions and of the problem of Reunion. Over very large areas of Christendom at least it is true to say that what chiefly holds the Churches apart to-day is no longer clash of creed nor estrangement of heart, but simply dismemberment, and the absence of joint organization. It is this dismemberment that cripples the Church, frustrating the uniting and lifegiving flow of the one Spirit. Unity of organization achieved, we could come together, through the interpenetration of truths now held in separative isolation and the new links of love forged in co-operative fellowship, to the discharge in common of our world-wide task. There are to-day scores of Churches sundered by no vital point of

[1] Much of this introduction to the subject as well as the narrative of the work of Section V. is contributed by the Rev. W. E. S. Holland, a Church of England missionary in India.

doctrine, yet ranged alongside each other in all the weakness and waste of friction and competition.

"In the Mission Field the folly and the shame are yet more patent. Groups of Buddhists or of Moslems, united up to the moment of their baptism in a single fellowship, find themselves as Christians partitioned off into watertight compartments unable to eat the one loaf or to drink the one cup together. The accidents of geography divide, not creed or sympathy. In one area the Church at work is Congregationalist, in the next area it is Anglican. Of the causes that hold them apart the convert Churches are as ignorant as they are innocent. And the glorious Church whose function is to manifest Christ's power to blend into one effective and world-wide brotherhood men of all classes and of every race, lies before them futile and paralysed, because rent and disorganized. The infant Churches of the East are held apart by the sinews of divisive organization that bind them to the schisms of Western Christendom.

"Yes: the problem of the Ministry is the gravest of all the issues that confront the Church as it seeks to recover unity. Over great tracts of Christendom commonly designated Catholic the conviction is widely held, and quite uncompromising, that our Lord instituted a self-propagating Society with its organization fixed and unchangeable, its Ministry authorized by divine appointment. It is illegitimate, on this view, for any group to separate and appoint its own Ministry. Such action is divisive of the unity of the Body, schismatic, contumacious. A Ministry so appointed can celebrate no valid

sacraments. Confronting this conception of the Ministry is the opinion held with equal tenacity by other Christian bodies that the Church in any area is free to develop its own organization; that in respect of its order or organization the Church is not static but dynamic and progressive, adapting itself with constant variety to an ever-changing environment; that what matters is not the form of the Ministry but its spirit.

"Such was the sharp issue confronting us. No wonder we approached the topic of the Ministry with inward misgiving. Was it reasonable to think we could march much farther along a common road? Moreover it was common knowledge that in almost all preceding Conferences on inter-confessional union discussion of the Ministry had proved the parting of the ways."

The procedure on this topic resembled that of other sections. First there was a plenary session of the whole Conference, when we listened to two papers from the Bishop of Bombay and Dr Scherer, General Secretary of the Lutheran Church of America. The Bishop's paper we awaited with eager expectation. He was known to have been a pioneer in the cause of unity in the negotiations between the Anglican and South India United Churches. His intellectual clarity, his Christian charity, his fearless daring were recognized. Had he not in his recent charge to his own clergy declared that "Ultimately the Spirit of Jesus Christ is the only test of the Catholicity of anything in the Church, for He alone is suited and necessary to all ages, all places, and all men"? It was therefore with some surprise that many listened to the

Bishop's uncompromising assertion of the extreme "Catholic" position in regard to the Ministry, insisting on the Apostolic Succession, and arguing that as the Bishops inherited their authority from the Apostles, the person ordained by the Bishops became "God's man": "The Bishops' 'irreviewable discretion,'" he said, "with all its awful responsibilities, was a counterpart to Christ's single will, and this no action on the part of a committee could ever hope to be." He believed that the traditional view of Ordination was divine, and that Christendom, if it hoped to be united, must return to this view. In carrying these arguments still further, the Bishop of Bombay remarked, "I cannot but think the Independent theory of the ministry to be a mistake. If it is intended that the Church should make a minister as a municipality installs a mayor, there is some error or confusion. Ordination is more than appointment to an office or to a sphere of work. It does something quite different —it puts a man into an Order, or company of persons who have a divine commission to share a particular part of Christ's work in the Church. The generosity of God provided many kinds of ministers to do His work. Let us not deny the largeness of His provision. Again, even when men try to work for and with Him in wrong ways or not the best ways, He may bless them. Let us not be misled by His generosity. Let us seek to find His 'first thoughts,' the best ways of doing His work. Some of our institutions may be mistakes, though He generously blesses us in them: just as our sins are still sins, though He uses sinful men to great purposes."

Dr Scherer's paper was as eirenic as the Bishop's was controversial. He explained that his Church was libero-eclectic—neither episcopal, presbyteral, nor congregational, but freely appropriating elements from all sides. If it was found in the interests of unity that Episcopacy was the best policy, his Church would adopt it. But he felt that the acknowledgment of Apostolic Succession could only lead logically to an acknowledgment of the Primacy of the Pope. To many the surprise of this paper was its emphasis on Luther's unwillingness to abandon Episcopacy and its assertion of the Lutheran Church's willingness to reconsider that issue. A new atmosphere of hopefulness followed the reading of this able and large-minded paper, which, it was widely felt, put us on a very long way towards agreement.

Before passing on to the section work on this subject, brief mention must be made of one of the shorter speeches in full session, that by the Rev. J. J. Banninga, D.D., of the South Indian United Church. The Bishop of Bombay had laid it down that " no local Church, only the whole Church or Christ Himself, could ever bestow universal authority upon a Ministry," and had developed this thought till serious obstacles appeared in the path of the recognition of local or sectional Ministries. Dr Banninga, in his speech, described the experience of ordination to such a Ministry. After touching with an impressiveness and reality, which members of older Churches might envy, upon inward vocation and personal surrender to Christ and of the subsequent stages in development, he outlined the significance of the service of ordination itself.

"No one who has not gone through this experience can realize what it means to one who has truly given himself in glad surrender to his Master for this high purpose. It is not so much the solemn assembly, nor the serious responsibilities that he is taking upon himself, nor even the part that men of high esteem and great respect are taking in the service. What he feels, above all else, is that he is then and there in the very presence of the Master Himself, and from Him receiving a special blessing which makes him in very reality 'God's man.' No Church, no Church officer, can make him such. It is a personal matter between him and his Master, and to the young man it is the Master Himself who lays hands on him and bids him go forth in His name to proclaim salvation to all men through faith. It is indeed a solemn hour, never to be forgotten. All about the ceremony itself may be forgotten. Even the names and faces of the men who took part in it may be forgotten. But the fact that, in that solemn hour, he and his Master stood face to face and that they there entered into a new covenant of service and of enduement with power will be something that can never pass from his mind, but will abide with him as a constant inspiration though he live far beyond the allotted fourscore years. And it is in the consciousness of that hour that he ministers in Christ's name to those who have been committed to his care."

Now came the important stage of detailed study of the topic in section. This section included more than a third of the membership of the entire Conference. It met under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Gloucester, a chairmanship welcomed

because of the lucidity, sanity, and practical statesmanship of the paper he had read to the Conference that morning. No paper had elicited such reiterated and long-continued applause. "He discovered to our section," narrates Mr Holland, "the sub-conscious preference of human kind for monarchical government, sketching for us in five minutes the order we were to follow instead of allowing us to spend weary and priceless hours in the discussion of procedure: Oh, the huge relief of all of us! The preliminary discussion at this meeting revealed a widespread readiness to consider with open mind even the thorniest of the questions which confronted us, while the assertion of an Anglican view of the Ministry, very different from that presented to us by the Bishop of Bombay, served to emphasize the significant character of the Anglican communion, as a kind of "Bridge Church," comprehending within its membership the widest differences of faith and practice, in touch on either wing with both the Catholic and the Protestant traditions of Christendom."

The section then divided into five sub-sections, one of which, in this brief account, must stand sample for the rest. "Quite by chance this particular group found itself to consist of twenty-two members, of whom only two (later on three) belonged to Episcopal Churches. Judge then of the surprise when the leading representative of the Congregational churches of America opened serious discussion by quietly stating that he presumed there was general recognition of the fact that a reunited Church was inconceivable except on the basis of an Episcopal Ministry, and the real

question before them was how to get there. And he found himself unanimously supported by the group, except for one member, who was unwilling to allow that Episcopal ordination should be the only avenue to the Ministry. There was, he said, no shadow of admission of defeat in their own Ministry. The Congregationalists, equally with Scottish Presbyterians, insisted that they had maintained in their Ministry the Apostolic Episcopate. But a reunited Christendom, with the Episcopal Church outside, would be *Hamlet* without Hamlet ; and it was recognized as alike undesirable and unthinkable that the very large section of the Church which attached high value to the historic Episcopate should be asked to repudiate and jettison it as a condition of union. Rather the ideal was the contribution by each branch of the Church of its own special heritage for the enrichment of the whole. Bishops, Presbyters, People—all have a rightful place in the ordination of the Ministry. A Catholic Ministry must preserve and unify the ministerial succession of Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists alike. The aim is unity, not uniformity : the reunion of Christendom in a universal Church. To this end an essential prerequisite is a Ministry whose authority is recognized and admitted by every section of the Church. Advance to this conclusion was made along two independent lines. On the one hand Scottish Presbyterians and American Free Churchmen alike asserted that there was in their Churches a growing sense of the value of what might be termed permanent Superintendents. On the other hand there is a conviction widely held in certain sections of

the Church that the unity of the Church and the regularity of its Ministry must always be precarious if, at any moment, a group could break away and erect a Ministry of its own. Particular emergencies, such as the Reformation, might be held to requite or even justify drastic expedients and sectional action; but such sectional action would tend to be subversive of the Church's unity; and it was essential to the organic action and unity of the whole Body that none should ordain to the Ministry except those to whom the whole Body had delegated authority so to do. It needs to be remembered that there is a very large body of opinion and tradition which sets a high value on the regular succession of authority quite apart from the particular administrative merits of Episcopal government. Both points of view find a place in the Report.

"One high authority in the Presbyterian Church was heard to affirm that for the sake of a Ministry recognized as valid through the Church of Christ he was even ready to be reordained; but only *once*: not first by Lambeth, then by Jerusalem, and then by Rome!

"On the other hand Americans constantly impressed on us the difficulties they would encounter in seeking to persuade thirty-eight million members of non-episcopal Churches to accept an Episcopacy the very idea of which was strange to them, and to escape from which the Pilgrim Fathers had sailed west. Scotland would never look at Prelacy; while Huguenots and Waldensians regarded the Episcopate as the organ of tyranny, persecution, and worldly pomp. Any Episcopacy to be accepted

must be strictly constitutional, and must conform much more closely to the primitive pattern. And on all sides it was insisted that if the fact of universal Episcopal government and ordination was to be achieved, there must be no requirement to accept any particular theory thereof. It is relevant here to refer to what Bishop Gore wrote in a subsequent account of the Conference, in the *Times*:[1] 'The emergent ideal of the Conference was excellently described by Dr Headlam. It is the ideal of a Church Universal, united in a common Faith, taught in Holy Scripture, handed down and safeguarded in the Nicene and the Apostles' Creeds, and confirmed in the experience of the Church: united also in the use of common sacraments, and in the acceptance of a common ministry which must be universally recognized; agreeing also that that ministry must be an Episcopal ministry—a ministry based upon Episcopal ordination—though it must also recognize side by side with the Episcopate the position of the Presbyterate and of the Congregation. No Anglican can easily object to the provision that the acceptance of the Episcopate should not be understood to involve more than that Episcopacy is of the *bene esse* of the Church, for whatever many of us believe, and whatever is contained in the general tradition of the Church, no more is required in our Communion.'

"The sub-section held two meetings between which two drafting committees, a smaller and a larger, had been at work. The actual draft was the work of an American Congregationalist: a lucid, logical, and progressive argument for the Reunion

[1] The *Times* of 24th August 1927.

of Christendom on the basis of Episcopal ordination which was unanimously accepted by this overwhelmingly non-Episcopalian group.

"When the whole section met together on the Monday afternoon one of the five sub-sections reported that it had failed to reach agreement: a result that was apparently due rather to procedure than to deeper causes. The reports of the other four sections were found to be on almost identical lines. Perhaps the most interesting moment of the debate was reached when a leading Presbyterian challenged as inaccurate the statement that Episcopal ordination was one of several methods of accomplishing Reunion which had been considered. He said: 'Am I not correct in stating that no other method of securing a reunited Church has ever been before us?' The silence that followed gave consent.

"Then followed a critical moment, one of those grave tests, the successful passing of which, more than anything else, served to assure us that God's hand was on us. A Greek representative presented a minute of dissent drawn up by members of the Orthodox Church. Then Bishop Gore rose to insist that our statement of agreement would fail in its purpose unless it were supplemented by a statement of the differences it comprehended, a statement that should show those on either wing that their point of view and the values by which they stood had been adequately before the Conference. It was a tense moment. It was felt that a stiffening of either side of the issue might involve hardening in antithesis of views which were not of necessity mutually exclusive. But conciliation

prevailed, and the crisis was safely passed. The ultimate effect upon the draft was a more careful balancing of the claims of the three types of Ministry, which it was hoped to combine in the reunited Church.

"As the result of the discussion by the section, a good deal of work remained for the sectional and central drafting committees in the way of revision and polish, but no essential change was made on either of the occasions on which this section's report came before the Conference in plenary session. That such a report should be unanimously received by the whole Conference and remitted to the consideration of the Churches is perhaps the most notable and significant achievement of the Lausanne Meeting. Few of us can have dared to expect that we should get so far. Ashamedness at our feeble faith struggles with gladness in the sense of a divine constraint that has led us along the road of that unity which is God's will.

"The document, though unsystematic and manifestly the product of discussion rather than of orderly argument, will repay close study, and indicates with all the authority thus far available the path along which we may hope to march towards corporate unity."

The Ministry of the Church

I

We, Members of the Conference on Faith and Order, are happy to report that we find ourselves

in substantial accord in the following five propositions.

1. The ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church, and is essential to the being and wellbeing of the Church.

2. The ministry is perpetually authorized and made effective through Christ and His Spirit.

3. The purpose of the ministry is to impart to men the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the Sacraments, to be made effective by faith.

4. The ministry is entrusted with the government and discipline of the Church, in whole or in part.

5. Men gifted for the work of the ministry, called by the Spirit, and accepted by the Church are commissioned through an act of ordination by prayer and the laying on of hands to exercise the function of this ministry.

II

Within the many Christian communions into which, in the course of history, Christendom has been divided, various forms of ministry have grown up according to the circumstances of the several communions and their beliefs as to the Mind of Christ and the guidance of the New Testament. These communions have been, in God's providence, manifestly and abundantly used by the Holy Spirit in His work of enlightening the world, converting sinners, and perfecting saints. But the differences which have arisen in regard to the authority and functions of these various forms of ministry have

been, and are, the occasion of manifold doubts, questions, and misunderstandings.

III

These differences concern the nature of the ministry (whether consisting of one or several orders), the nature of ordination, and of the grace conferred thereby, the function and authority of Bishops, and the nature of Apostolic Succession. We believe that the first step toward the overcoming of these difficulties is the frank recognition that they exist, and the clear definition of their nature. We therefore add as an appendix to our Report such a statement, commending it to the thoughtful consideration of the Churches we represent.

IV

By these differences the difficulties of intercommunion have been accentuated to the distress and wounding of faithful souls, while in the Mission Field, where the Church is fulfilling its primary object to preach the Gospel to every creature, the young Churches find the lack of unity a very serious obstacle to the furtherance of the Gospel. Consequently the provision of a ministry acknowledged in every part of the Church as possessing the sanction of the whole Church is an urgent need.

V

There has not been time in this Conference to consider all the points of difference between us in

the matter of the ministry with that care and patience which could alone lead to complete agreement. The same observation applies equally to proposals for the constitution of the United Church. Certain suggestions as to possible Church organization have been made, which we transmit to the Churches with the earnest hope that common study of these questions will be continued by the members of the various Churches represented in this Conference.

In view of (1) the place which the Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters, and the Congregation of the Faithful respectively had in the constitution of the early Church, and, (2) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems of government are each to-day, and have been for centuries, accepted by great communions in Christendom, and (3) the fact that episcopal, presbyteral, and congregational systems are each believed by many to be essential to the good order of the Church—we therefore recognize that these several elements must all, under conditions which require further study, have an appropriate place in the order of life of a reunited Church, and that each separate communion, recalling the abundant blessing of God vouchsafed to its ministry in the past, should gladly bring to the common life of the United Church its own spiritual treasures.

If the foregoing suggestion be accepted and acted upon, it is essential that the acceptance of any special form of ordination as the regular and orderly method of introduction into the ministry of the Church for the future, should not be interpreted to imply the acceptance of any one particular theory

of the origin, character, or function of any office in the Church, or to involve the acceptance of any adverse judgment on the validity of ordination in those branches of the Church universal that believe themselves to have retained valid and apostolic orders under other forms of ordination, or as disowning or discrediting a past or present ministry of the Word and Sacraments which has been used and blessed by the Spirit of God.

It is further recognized that inasmuch as the Holy Spirit is bestowed upon every believer, and each believer has an immediate access to God through Jesus Christ, and since special gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as teaching, preaching, and spiritual counsel, are the treasures of the Church as well as of the individual, it is necessary and proper that the Church should make fuller use of such gifts for the development of its corporate spiritual life and for the extension of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

VI

In particular, we share in the conviction, repeatedly expressed in this Conference, that pending the solution of the questions of Faith and Order in which agreements have not yet been reached, it is possible for us, not simply as individuals, but as Churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples. We therefore commend to our Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity in service, to more effective expression.

VII

In conclution, we express our thankfulness to Almighty God for the great progress which has been made in recent years in the mutual approach of the Churches to one another, and our conviction that we must go forward with faith and courage, confident that with the blessing of God we shall be able to solve the problems that lie before us.

NOTE

A. The following is the view of the Orthodox Church, as formulated for us by its representatives.

"The Orthodox Church, regarding the ministry as instituted in the Church by Christ Himself, and as the Body which by a special charisma is the organ through which the Church spreads its means of grace such as the Sacraments, and believing that the ministry in its threefold form of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, can only be based on the unbroken apostolic succession, regrets that it is unable to come in regard to the ministry into some measure of agreement with many of the Churches represented at this Conference, but prays God that He through His Holy Spirit will guide to union even in regard to this difficult point of disagreement."

B. In Western Christendom also there are conspicuous differences.

One representative view includes the following points: (*a*) that there have always been various grades of the ministry, each with its own function; (*b*) that ordination is a sacramental act of divine institution, and therefore indispensable, conveying the special charisma for the particular ministry; (*c*) that Bishops who have received their office by succession from the Apostles are the necessary ministers of ordination; (*d*) that the apostolic succession so understood is necessary for the authority of the ministry, the visible unity of the Church, and the validity of the Sacraments.

On the other hand, it is held by many Churches represented in the Conference (*a*) that essentially there is only one ministry,

that of the Word and Sacraments; (*b*) that the existing ministries in these Churches are agreeable to the New Testament, are proved by their fruits and have due authority in the Church, and the Sacraments ministered by them are valid; (*c*) that no particular form of ministry is necessary to be received as a matter of faith; (*d*) that the grace which fits men for the ministry is immediately given by God, and is recognized, not conferred, in ordination.

Further, we record that there are views concerning the ministry which are intermediate between the types just mentioned. For instance, some who adhere to an Episcopal system of Church government do not consider that the Apostolic Succession, as described above, is a vital element of Episcopacy, or they reject it altogether. Others do not regard as essential the historic Episcopate. Those who adhere to Presbyteral systems of Church government believe that the apostolic ministry is transmissible, and has been transmitted through presbyters orderly associated for the purpose. Those who adhere to the Congregational system of government define their ministry as having been and being transmitted according to the precedent and example of the New Testament.

VII

THE BROTHERHOOD MEAL

ADJOINING the hall in which our meetings were held, and under the same roof, was a large picture-gallery, considerably patronized by members of the Conference in between the sessions. Among several good pictures in that gallery the most noteworthy was the *Last Supper* by the famous Swiss artist Eugène Burnand, a picture in which realism and reverence meet. There had been an idea of asking the Swiss authorities to allow the picture to be hung in the hall where our sessions were held, for the period of the Conference, but the project fell through. Anyhow it was refreshing to go and look at the picture in between whiles, even if our eyes could not rest on it while the meetings were actually in progress.

One's mind's eye wandered off to that picture pretty frequently when the Conference was grappling with the subject of the Sacraments. And the contrast suggested was rather poignant: He giving to His friends, then and for all time, a sacred meal which was to be at once a pledge of His abiding love and a symbol of their complete unity the one with the other in Him; we, twenty centuries later, servants of His, and in some sort of fellowship with one another, but quite unable to partake of the Meal together, and not without misgivings as we attempt

to seek a common mind about its meaning and its use. It was a relief to many of us, in our common devotions and especially in the mid-Conference Cathedral Service, to be called to express our deep penitence for such gross and culpable failure.

The morning sessions of the Conference were presided over by various eminent people (thus giving some rest to our hard-worked regular chairman and vice-chairman, Bishop Brent and Dr Garvie), and the chairman on this day, Saturday, 13th August, was, fitly enough, Sir Henry Lunn, the well-known Free Church leader. It was Sir Henry Lunn who convened at Grindelwald, in 1892, one of the first Unity Conferences, and he has been an earnest worker in the cause of Reunion ever since. The two chief addresses represented, as perhaps it was well that they should, sharply contrasted points of view. The first paper was written by the Serbian Bishop Nicolai of Ochrida, representing the Eastern Orthodox Church, and, in his absence, was read by Metropolitan Germanos of London. The paper was an uncompromising assertion of the sacramental position of the Orthodox Church, and seemed (I stress the word *seemed*, for a paper, on such an occasion, may not accurately represent a man's real belief) to betray an absence of any really fresh thinking on the subject, and a curious unawareness that the Spirit of God *might* conceivably work in other ways and by other means. The Bishop said there were seven Sacraments, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Ordination, Marriage, and Extreme Unction. While recognizing that important problems arise in connection with the other sacra-

mental rites of the Church, the Subjects Committee had recommended that discussion and action be limited, so far as possible, to Baptism and the Lord's Supper only. The Eastern Church representative, however, defined all seven rites as "Mysteries," and opposed limitation of the discussion to the two selected. "As for us of the East," he said, "we are afraid to depreciate any of the seven marvellous Mysteries." He also argued against any attempt to set up modern opinion against tradition in an interpretation of the Sacraments. "The opinions of intellectual persons," he said, "may be wonderfully clever and yet be false, whereas the experience of the saints is always true."

The second speaker was the Rev. J. Vernon Bartlet of Mansfield College, Oxford, a leading Congregationalist. Dr Bartlet declared that the two Sacraments, of the Lord's Supper and of Baptism, presented the point at which the diversities of conception represented at the Conference "come to a head in practice," and the great "dividing line and barrier to fuller fellowship." He acknowledged that attempts to reconcile these differences in the past had failed, but held that the new spirit prevailing among the Churches offered hopes of reconciliation now. Modern experience, the recent comparative study of Old Testament writings and of history, he said, all tended to interpret the ancient forms of the Church in relation to their meaning for human experience. "They were made for man, not men for them." In discussing the original meaning of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, Dr Bartlet emphasized what

was clearly its central idea, namely the Redemptive significance of Christ's death. "The one really valid meaning of this Sacrament is that implied in the words of Administration in the Anglican Prayer Book of 1552, 'Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.'"

The paper offered a reasoned "Evangelical" view of "the Real Presence" which may be quoted—"As to the idea of 'the Real Presence,' namely, of Christ's *body* and *blood* in the elements, rather than of His spiritual humanity under bodily forms—available as that is at all times to believers for communion through the Spirit—it is a pure accretion of a non-Hebraic and sub-personal order. It came in originally to satisfy the Hellenistic mentality, in its craving after a quasi-physical 'food of immortality' for the corruptible human body; but it strongly influenced both the language and sacramental thought of the Patristic and Mediæval Church long after its original bodily rather than devotional interest was forgotten. Evangelical grounds of objection to any realistic theory of Christ's bodily presence, however attenuated its corporeal nature may be, are not only its exegetical impossibility (as above argued), and the physical impossibility of bodily ubiquity. They include also its irrelevance to the communion of persons, and the fact that, in claiming a superiority *in kind* for the sacramental species of grace, it lowers in idea the level of normal or abiding spiritual communion of Christians with Christ, and so creates a dualism in the life of grace as a whole. In neither of these two latter regards can the

doctrine be brought into harmony with the genius of the Gospel of Christ and of His Apostles, and of the nature of grace and faith in the New Testament sense. Yet such harmony is the final test of all properly Christian Sacramental theory."

The paper ended with some illuminating discussion of the "development" of sacramental doctrine from its historical beginnings, of the "philosophy of sacraments," and of a possible synthesis as between the "Catholic" and "Evangelical" conceptions. "In the above historical survey [given in the early part of the paper] I have tried to state frankly the essential Evangelical doctrine of the Sacraments as rooted in Scripture, with some passing allusion to the points at which the Catholic doctrine has come to diverge from what Evangelicals regard as the lines of true development, into serious changes in conception. I have distinguished, moreover, what I regard even as true developments in the Church sacramental doctrine, from the essential idea of the Sacraments, as these have the full sanction of Christ Himself. Such true ecclesiastical developments have a relative value for the Church, both in its different specific groups and as a whole: and it is the ultimate aim of our Conference to appraise and use them aright. As to those conceptions and usages which Catholics or Evangelicals cannot but continue to view as mistaken or defective, and so cannot adopt from each other for the enrichment of their Christian life, they need not in the last resort hinder intercommunion: for they do not cancel the unity of underlying idea as apprehended in personal experience. And while deeply convinced that the Evangelical understanding of them

best preserves generally and at the most vital points the original New Testament emphasis and perspective, and that this is the abiding test of true developments, I yet acknowledge that at certain points Catholic piety has better safeguarded in its own way true Christian values, those most closely connected with its strong sense of the corporate nature of the Church. These will doubtless be duly brought out by those who represent the Catholic standpoint.

" I would add a few words on what may be called the philosophy of Sacraments. First, then, Evangelicals hold the true order to be 'Word and Sacraments,' not *vice versa* : for the former psychologically conditions the latter, as means by which the Holy Spirit works graciously on the soul. Next, by Sacraments they mean the rites as a whole, not the material elements characteristic of each. So regarded, namely as symbolic acts of the Church, Sacraments are, in Augustine's phrase, 'visible words.' Thus the difference between them and the word of the Gospel fades away : and they are seen as special forms of the same spiritual appeal to personality which words convey in a less concrete and sensibly vivid manner. Hence they are valuable complements to the spoken word, their suggestiveness often speaking with silent eloquence, as the Holy Spirit interprets them to the heart, when the more abstract appeal of the audible word has for the time lost its full power. Being unargumentative, they penetrate the more by suggestion to the semi-conscious and intuitive levels where lie deep springs of emotion and volition. On lines such as these, rather than on

those of Catholic theory as to objective change in the elements, should we conceive the true 'spiritualization of the material' which we all aim at.

"I will close on two notes of a synthetic tendency. While I have stressed the nature of Christianity and of its Sacraments in terms of personality, and personal rather than sub-personal conceptions of sacramental means of grace, I rejoice to recognize that personality is far from one and the same as individualism, or even individuality in any restricted sense: it is the soul of corporate and even institutional life also, so far as these attain their highest human forms. It may be common, then, to the Catholic and Evangelical emphasis on the corporate and the individual aspects of religion respectively. As regards the feeling among Catholics that the Evangelical conception of the Sacraments is too subjective, I would beg them constantly to remember that Evangelicals regard all grace as due to the action of the Holy Spirit, and that to them this makes sacramental grace as objective as it need or can be for persons as such.

"Finally, and most emphatically, I plead for the largest tolerance of diversity in the various constituent groups of any future closer solidarity of organized Church communion, in the spirit of the golden words of the Lambeth appeal: 'We believe that for all the truly equitable approach to union is by the way of mutual deference to one another's consciences.'"

Of the total number of fifteen-minutes prepared speeches that were delivered after the reading of the half-hour papers and before the general discus-

sion, some were pertinent, interesting, and illuminating and others—rather less so. To the former category belongs a brilliant and characteristically closely reasoned address on the Sacraments by Canon Oliver Quick of Carlisle, which undoubtedly influenced the subsequent work of the section and subsection, and therefore deserves fairly full quotation at this point. "I propose, he said, "to confine myself to the first of the questions asked in the Subjects Committee's pamphlet, that concerned with the parts of God and man in the Sacraments. I have it in mind to state briefly four cardinal principles which might conceivably receive a general assent or at any rate help to clarify discussion. Two are concerned with God's part and two with man's. And each pair forms to some extent an antithesis.

"(1) *In every Sacrament the principal inward reality* (*res sacramenti*) *is a divine act.* In Baptism, in the Eucharist, and every other rite to which the name of Sacrament may be properly applied, our chief and dominant aim should be, not so much to declare our own faith before God, not so much to express our own unity with one another, as to receive into our own souls some actual blessing or gift from God. As we perform the appointed signs in obedience to what we believe to be God's will, we look to God to come among us in the living and present power of His Spirit. We declare our faith, our penitence, our fellowship, in order that by these means our souls may be more open towards the divine beneficence. The chief end is not in a reminder of the past, nor in men's mutual encouragement of one another to lead a

Christian life, but rather it is to receive the full efficiency of a present act of God.

"(2) *On the other hand, the Sacraments in no way limit God's gracious activity, so as to restrict its range. Deus non alligatur sacramentis.* We dare not affirm that, apart from some particular sign, or from all sacramental sign whatever, any divine grace or gift is unobtainable. Rather, we rejoice to believe that our Saviour is also the light that lighteth every man, and leads in the way of salvation all men who do not wilfully and of their own fault reject His guidance. Moreover, God alone knows the hearts of men; many that are last shall be first, and the first last. May it not be true to say that nothing will more surely condemn us before the Father of all, than that we should refuse to recognize the presence and work of the Spirit, on the ground that these show themselves outside an appointed system of ordinances, or because God the Holy Spirit, no less than God the Son, may sometimes come out of Nazareth?

"The acceptance of the principle just stated evidently necessitates some kind of distinction between validity and efficacy in Sacraments. A valid Sacrament is one in which all the appointed signs are duly performed; but it is not necessarily efficacious for salvation in the individual, since it may be unworthily received. On the other hand, a rite or service, in which appointed sacramental signs are imperfectly performed or not performed at all, may certainly be used by God to bestow His spiritual gifts, and undoubtedly is so used where true penitence and faith are present. It follows then that services which are

not valid Sacraments at all may nevertheless be efficacious in bestowing grace; just as valid Sacraments themselves fail to bestow grace, where the soul is not open to receive it. Nothing perhaps confuses discussion on the Sacraments so easily or so fatally than a failure to distinguish validity from efficacy. It does not of course follow that, because God may and does bestow gifts apart from the appointed signs of Sacraments, therefore it does not matter whether a Sacrament is valid or not.

"(3) *True faith and penitence are necessary conditions for the effectual receiving of God's gifts in the Sacraments.* In other words, God gives to the soul only that grace which it is spiritually capable of receiving; and according to their capacity some will receive more and others less. It is characteristic of our Lord's whole method of work and teaching, as recorded in the Gospels, that He constantly requires some measure of co-operation or at least receptiveness from those whom He seeks to help. 'To him that hath, it shall be given.' 'Those who seek, find.' 'According to your faith be it done unto you.' We cannot believe that divine action in the Sacraments follows a different law. The Sacraments, therefore, do not work for man's salvation mechanically or in any magical way. The Western Church indeed has long taught the doctrine of sacramental grace *ex opere operate*, which has been severely criticized for its magical tendencies. But that doctrine has never been authoritatively held or taught so as to remove the need for due preparation on the part of those who are to receive

sacraments to their soul's health. Indeed it has been more usual in the past to surround the Eucharist with an almost excessive dread of unworthy reception and its awful penalties, than to allow men to suppose that the mere outward act of partaking was enough to profit them. And yet, in saying this, we need not forget that it is the sick, not the whole, who most need the Great Physician; Solomon, we are told, received the gift of wisdom, because he was already wise enough to know his need of it, and to ask God for its supply. Socrates claimed to be the wisest of men, on the ground that he alone knew himself ignorant. So it is that they who are most aware of their own spiritual poverty, have already most of that real wealth which God delights to increase and multiply. It is only to him that hath, that the gift is given. Yet he who has most, is the beggar in spirit.

"(4) *Nevertheless the soul can receive infinitely more in the Sacraments than it is itself aware of.* To say that we must prepare ourselves to receive in faith and penitence is not to say that our consciousness can grasp all that is bestowed upon us. The Sacraments, as the Bishop of Ochrida's paper has reminded us, are God's mysteries. In them God acts upon us. Who shall say that he is aware of all that God so does? This is a point, I fear, on which some divergence of opinion is likely. The reason why many of us find something more, or at least something other, in a sacrament than in a sermon is precisely this. Spoken words are only meant to affect us in so far as their meaning is made clear to our understanding. At least that is the only use of words which is legitimate, if we

follow the teaching of St Paul. Music, again, acts not on the understanding but more directly on the feelings. Both words and music may truly be inspired. But in a sacrament there is something more or something different. It consists also of something done to us, an act of God upon our souls, which does not depend wholly either upon conscious understanding or on conscious feeling for its effectiveness. True, the effectiveness, the efficacy of a Sacrament does and must depend in some degree upon the human *will*. We must be endeavouring in some way to hold communion with Christ, before Christ can communicate Himself to us. But if we are sincerely making that tremendous effort of faith, we must not be told that, if our conscious success is small, we have therefore in reality received as little. The understanding may be darkened and the feelings hard to stir, but Christ is greater than our minds or hearts, and we believe that in the breaking of the bread, He has come to us again."

This speech set us all thinking hard. Perhaps after all there were agreements deeper than the differences in the papers of the Bishop of Ochrida and Dr Bartlet. And, the more we discussed, the more clearly became apparent to our minds the strength and reality of the experience in the Sacraments common to us all. We were all at one in believing that in the breaking of bread the Christ does in fact make Himself known to us. But if this is so, why should we feel it so ambitious, so dangerous even, to consider the possibility of intercommunion, or of steps that might lead towards that consummated fellowship ? The point

was bound to be taken up, and it was taken up, wisely and sympathetically, by the Principal of Wesley College, Cambridge, Dr H. Maldwyn Hughes. "We have already," he said, "reached agreement on some carefully worded formulæ, but thousands of our fellow-Christians and the great world outside look for some act which will give a practical demonstration of the reality of the unity which we all believe already exists amongst us. What act could be so effective and convincing as some step or declaration which should prepare the way for intercommunion between all those who are members of the Body of Christ ?

"Doubtless, at this point, some may be thinking that it is unwise to raise so thorny an issue at this stage, but I am not unaware of the difficulties of the situation, nor do I regard lightly or with indifference sincere, conscientious convictions. I do not think that we can hope to solve the problem along the ordinary lines of approach, dogmatic and historical. The discussions in England on the basis of the Lambeth Appeal have shown that that road ends in a *cul-de-sac*.

"But I want to ask whether there is not another method of approach. Is it not possible for us, under the inspiration of the Spirit of God, to rise to a higher spiritual plane on which our differences will be transcended ? I would suggest that whatever our doctrinal explanations, fundamentally and experimentally, the Sacrament of the Holy Communion means very much the same thing to all of us. We all believe in the Real Presence of our Living Lord, if not in the elements yet in the whole Sacramental Service, and our purpose is 'to

feed on Him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving.' I believe that all here would agree with an honoured teacher of my own Church in likening the Sacrament of the Holy Communion to the trysting-place of the lover and the beloved. Cannot we be content with that great reality of experience and agree to differ as to doctrinal interpretations? Cannot we be content to go together to meet our Lord at the appointed trysting-place, willing to leave it an open question as to exactly how He meets with us?

"As the Bishop of Ochrida said: 'Whenever the Holy Spirit descends upon men through His grace, is it not indifferent how He arrives? . . . It is He that matters.' The same is true of the Living Christ. Confronted by the secularizing and paganizing tendencies of the age, are we not bound in loyalty to our Lord to achieve a visible expression of the unity which none of us denies? After all, we are not considering a Table, or Feast of our own, but the Table and Feast of our living Master. He is the Host who invites us to be His guests, and have we any right to refuse fellowship with any whom we have every reason to believe He would not repel? As our Lord said when speaking of the Bread of Life: 'All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me' (John vi. 37).

"I know that there are many who are deeply distressed that they are unable to communicate with their fellow-Christians, but who feel conscientiously that the course which I am advocating would hinder rather than hasten the real unity which is desired.

"But I would ask, Is it conceivable that the fellowship of love can prove a barrier to vital unity?"

After these speeches, and others which are unrecorded here only for lack of space, the section on the Sacraments, widely representative like the other sections, took up its task. Bishop James Cannon, Jr., D.D., of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was chairman in virtue of his appointment by the Continuation Committee. On his nomination the section elected Rev. F. Luke Wiseman vice-chairman, Rev. Canon O. C. Quick, Pfarrer Sasse of Berlin, and Professor Choisy of the University of Geneva as secretaries. Bishop Cannon announced the appointment of the following chairmen of sub-sections: Bishop Wm. J. Manning, of New York, Professor James Vernon Bartlet, of Mansfield College, Oxford, Professor Heinrich Hermelink, of Marburg, and Dean Edmund Soper, of Durham, North Carolina.

"On the first two afternoons," records Dr Soper,[1] "the section met as a whole and engaged in a general discussion of any and all phases of the subject. As might be expected, the most varied opinions were expressed. On the second evening the officers of the section and the leaders of the sub-sections met and decided upon a set of questions to be presented to the sub-sections. It might be said here that in only one of these groups was much use made of these questions. Each group showed its independence by going its own way, dealing with the general question of the

[1] The account which follows of the section work is contributed by Dean Soper.

Sacraments as it saw fit. After a most thorough discussion, in each sub-section, of every phase of the subject the limited time allowed, the four reports were handed in to a committee of the officers and leaders of the sub-sections to blend as well as they could with a view to bringing in a unified report to the full session of the section.

"When the full session met, the report was called for and read. It did not prove satisfactory to the section. It was not a unity; indeed it scarcely could have been, with the limited time which was at the disposal of the committee. During the discussion, the report of the sub-section which had furnished the most finished report was called for as likely to offer a better basis of discussion than the more extended and uneven report of the committee. When this report was read, it was adopted, after some debate, as the basis of discussion, and, ultimately, of the final report of the section to the full Conference.

"By the time this decision was reached the time for the session was exhausted, so it was determined to hand over the document to a drafting committee with power to report the result of their work to the Conference as the report of the section. In order to provide that the drafting committee might be representative of all phases of opinion, the committee was enlarged to nineteen. It consisted then of several co-opted members in addition to the officers of the section, the leaders of the sub-sections, and two other members of each sub-section who, with the chairman, had formulated the report of the sub-section.

"This enlarged drafting committee had two

sessions, lasting in all some seven hours. The subject was one of great difficulty. This subject and that of the Ministry were generally looked upon as full of pitfalls and snags. In fact the Sacraments and the Ministry are so intimately related that, in the estimation of many, it was a mistake to try and treat them separately. There were many extremes to be satisfied or included in a unified report. There were the members of the Holy Orthodox Church with their rigid views with respect both to the Ministry and the Sacraments. A so-called Sacrament is in no sense a Sacrament in their estimation unless administered by an ordained priest who is in the Apostolic Succession. There is no salvation without sacraments, which means no salvation outside the Church. The question was asked whether under certain conditions a man might not be saved who had not been baptized by a regularly ordained priest, under conditions known familiarly in the West as the "Uncovenanted mercies of God." About as far as the representatives of the Orthodox Church would go was to say that they did not know. Thus, a purely agnostic position at so important a point made a unified report almost an impossibility. At the other extreme were the Friends, who observe no sacramental forms. Yet it was interesting to hear one of their number express the hope that the other members of the section would not consider them totally without what the Sacraments in the other Churches stood for. But here they were, a Church without Sacraments. And in between these two extremes were Anglicans, High and Low, Lutherans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists,

Methodists, Baptists, and others. What could a report on the Sacraments do when it had so many bodies to deal with, if it attempted to cover them all in a unified statement?

"One must go to the report itself to study the result of the prolonged discussions. At any rate one satisfactory discovery was made. Almost all, if not all the members of the drafting committee found themselves amazed at the number of statements which can be made as expressing the common belief of the group. The fact that Christ is present in the Sacrament of the Holy Communion is held most vigorously by all, though there is wide divergence as to the manner of His presence. This was a great gain, to be able to realize that we all go to the table of our Lord and there meet and have communion with Him.

"A number of other features of the Sacraments were found to be held in common, and these were made as explicit and clear as possible. But there was no danger that differences would be pushed aside and not considered. They were discussed fully, so far, of course, as the time allowed—and statements were made in the report making that fact clear.

"A considerable time was spent in discussing the relation of our report to the Seven Sacraments of the Holy Orthodox Church and of the Anglo-Catholics and the Two Sacraments of Protestantism in general. We frankly registered this difference, but recorded our decision that we could, in this Conference, deal with two only, Baptism and Holy Communion, as the only Sacraments on which the members of this Conference could unite. In the

end the Orthodox Church found itself unable to unite with the others in any statements respecting the Sacraments. For all the rest of the section, except the Orthodox members,[1] the final result was a single report agreed to by all. This does not mean that anyone was completely satisfied, or that all which he felt was expressed, but it does mean that he could unite with others in at least this statement of common belief relative to the Sacraments."

The report of the section was brought before the full Conference on Thursday morning, 18th August, for its "first reading"; then after retouching by the drafting committee, came up again to be finally "received" two days later.

The Sacraments

We are convinced that for the purpose in view in this Conference, we should not go into detail in considering Sacraments—by some called "Mysteries." The purpose therefore of this statement is to show that there may be a common approach to and appreciation of Sacraments on the part of those who may otherwise differ in conception and interpretation.

We testify to the fact that the Christian world gives evidence of an increasing sense of the significance and value of Sacraments, and would express our belief that this movement should be fostered and guided as a means of deepening the life and

[1] For the Orthodox "Statement" of their position to the Conference, see Chapter IX., pp. 152 *ff.*

experience of the Churches. In this connection we recognize that the Sacraments have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church, and that the Grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through Faith.

We agree that Sacraments are of divine appointment, and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts.

We hold that in the Sacraments there is an outward sign and an inward grace, and that the Sacraments are means of Grace through which God works invisibly in us. We recognize also that in the gifts of His Grace God is not limited by His own Sacraments.

The Orthodox Church and others hold that there are seven Sacraments, and that for their valid administration there must be a proper form, a proper matter, and a proper ministry. Others can regard only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Sacraments. Others again, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward signs of Sacraments, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through immediate contact with God through His Spirit. In this Conference we lay stress on the two Sacraments of Baptism and Lord's Supper, because they are the Sacraments which are generally acknowlegded by the members of this Conference.

We believe that in Baptism administered with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, for the remission of sins, we are baptized by one Spirit into one body. By this statement it is not meant to ignore the differences

in conception, interpretation, and mode which exist among us.

We believe that in the Holy Communion our Lord is present, that we have fellowship with God our Father in Jesus Christ His Son, our Living Lord, who is our one Bread, given for the life of the world, sustaining the life of all His people, and that we are in fellowship with all others who are united to Him. We agree that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is the Church's most sacred act of worship in which the Lord's atoning death is commemorated and proclaimed, and that it is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and an act of solemn self-oblation.

There are among us divergent views, especially as to (1) the mode and manner of the presence of our Lord ; (2) the conception of the commemoration and the sacrifice ; (3) the relation of the elements to the grace conveyed ; and (4) the relation between the minister of this Sacrament and the validity and efficacy of the rite. We are aware that the reality of the divine presence and gift in this Sacrament cannot be adequately apprehended by human thought or expressed in human language.

We close this statement with the prayer that the differences which prevent full communion at the present time may be removed.

VIII

CHRISTENDOM AND CHURCH UNITY

Perhaps it was too much to hope that the Conference, launched so auspiciously and making good early progress, should enjoy calm seas and no contrary winds for the whole of the three weeks' voyage. The last days of the Conference we did, for our chastening, run into some rough water; and it was due to good work on the bridge, and fine seamanship all round, that there was never any real fear of shipwreck, and that only a very small portion of our cargo had to be jettisoned in reaching port.

There was some trouble, as recorded in the previous chapter, over the sixth report, on the Sacraments. But there was much more trouble over the seventh report, that on "The Unity of Christendom in relation to existing Churches." The difficulty that arose, as was evident as the discussions proceeded, was inherent in the subject itself and in its wording. We were not at Lausanne, as our chairman wisely and frequently reminded us, to formulate a scheme of Reunion. But to handle Subject VII. without sketching an outline of a reunited Church proved too subtle a task. Moreover, however desirous some of us were (and the present writer is frankly of the number) to see our God-given agreements translated, without

over-cautious delay, into proposals for action, we had to admit that to give serious consideration to and reach agreement on such proposals in a hurried day or two at the end of a long Conference was out of the question.

Our difficulties did not in fact arise until after the section had done its work and brought its report to the Conference. Before this stage was reached we listened to the valuable papers on unity by Archbishop Söderblom of Upsala, head of the Lutheran Church of Sweden, and the Bishop of Gloucester. The Archbishop said [1] that Christian unity expressed itself through the love, the faith, and the organization of the Church. Christianity was not an intellectual aristocracy. A simple, childlike philanthropist who was sincere, warm-hearted, and self-sacrificing was far nearer to Christianity than the most splendid misanthropist. Unity must find its expression in clear, thoroughly thought out words and forms. Christianity meant a dramatic dialogue between a me and a Thee, between the soul and its Creator, between humanity and its God. The first and last condition for unity in the matter of Church organization and order was the clear acknowledgment that all that was meant by Church organization, order, and constitution had a single purpose, in that the Church through God's Word and Sacraments carried the mystery of salvation to the hearts of men and educated them. Different forms had evolved, but, as long as the already mentioned purpose were kept in view, there existed a profound unity in spite of the differences.

[1] *Cf.* summary in the *Times* of 16th August 1927.

The Bishop of Gloucester, whose address was warmly applauded, said that it was somewhat difficult to discuss what the relation of the existing Churches should be to the future united Church unless decisions had been taken as to the lines on which unity of Christendom was to be attained. He believed that the ideal before them was a unity possessing the greatest possible diversity—not a mere combination of different bodies for the mere sake of efficiency, but a spiritual unity. The unity of the Church must be a unity of Faith, a unity in the Sacraments, and a unity in the Ministry. The unity of the faith should be in the words already suggested—"The Faith of Christ as taught in Holy Scriptures and handed down in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds." It was not the Creeds or the Scriptures that they believed in, but the faith that they taught. This was important, as it meant that they were not committed to any particular theory of inspiration, and Creeds were accepted, not as invariable or inerrant or necessarily unchangeable documents, but as the traditional expression of the Faith of Christ. Unity in the Sacraments meant the acceptance of the Sacraments and not of any particular teaching about them. Unity could be found in worship but not in definition. As regards the union in Ministry, the Christian minister was not merely an official appointed for the convenience of society. His appointment came from God, but "I have no doubt," said the Bishop, "that this union in the ministry must mean the acceptance of the traditional form of the Christian ministry, the acceptance of Episcopacy and of Episcopal Ordination. It is

not my purpose at this time to discuss how that may be brought about; I would only say this, that I do not think that it is possible for any one Church to go to any other and say, 'Our Orders are valid, yours are not.' It is not possible for them to say, 'We have the succession, you have not.' The only full and complete Orders would be those given in a united Church, and because the Church is divided therefore all Orders are irregular and no succession is perfect. The unity of two branches of the Christian Church must come by each giving what it can to the other in the ordination of its clergy."

Discussing "variety," the Bishop of Gloucester said there were two separate problems—the relation to one another of the different National Churches, and that which presented itself where there was no National Church but a vast number of separated religious societies or Churches. After elaborating these points, Dr Headlam returned to his opinion that it was necessary to have before them as their ideal means of unity one leaving great room for diversity and variety. He concluded by insisting that a fundamental postulate of their united Christianity must be freedom and toleration. He was shocked when he heard that only in recent years in one country the Roman Church had joined with the Socialists to despoil a Protestant Church of its building. He was equally shocked when he heard that in another country a Protestant Church had joined with the anti-Clerical State to prohibit Roman Catholic schools. He was shocked at the way in which modern Liberalism had failed to realize that educational freedom meant freedom to

teach one's children one's faith as well as freedom from a State or Church imposing its creed upon the children. It would be useless and dangerous for them to build up any form of United Church unless all alike—Romanist, Anglican, Protestant, Nonconformist—had learned the fundamental doctrines of Christian liberty.

The Bishop's paper forms a noteworthy contribution to the whole subject of Reunion, and should be closely studied by all Church people who are working for unity.

The shorter speeches on this theme were all worth listening to. Dr Peter Ainslie of Baltimore, of the representatives of the " Disciples of Christ," spoke of the great multitude who are slowly turning away from the Church " because of our unbrotherly traditions," and asserted that the Church, in all parts of the world, is beginning to see that those divisions, however sacredly guarded now, are artificial, abnormal, and unspiritual, and that diversity within unity is the spiritual and normal possibility toward which we must move.

" Our greatest difficulty," he added, " lies in getting our eyes off the communion of which we are parts and seeing only Jesus Christ, the crucified and glorified Son of God. Our denominationalism has obscured Him (and I am using the word denomination as applied to all the divisions of Christendom). Denominational loyalty is a foreign phrase in these days of an agonizing world. Christ is supreme, and to Him our loyalties belong.

" My denomination must grow less in my eyes if I am to grow more toward Christ. I am willing that my denomination shall be forgotten if thereby

may be hastened the unity of the Church of our God. That denomination is most prophetic that is willing to disappear for Christ's sake—to go to its disappearance as deliberately as Christ went to His crucifixion."

Dr T. M. Shaw, of the United Church of Canada (in which Presbyterians, Methodists, and Congregationalists have joined), insisted that "federation" of Churches can only be regarded as a first step towards a more complete and organic union. This union, he urged, will only be achieved by the Churches proving willing to reconsider their particular theories and predilections in the light of the New Testament, and ask themselves what according to the New Testament standard and perspective is fundamental and essential to the very existence and purpose of the Church as the Body of Christ, the organ and instrument of the manifestation and realization of His mind and will in the world. Dr Shaw also—and surely this is true of every other delegate!—was "sound" on the "variety-in-unity" principle characterizing any reunited Church. "Any real, reunited, Catholic Church," he cried, "must conserve and include the true spiritual or religious values for which each Church has historically stood. In a reunited Christendom there must not be one lost good."

Dr R. F. Barbour, of the United Free Church of Scotland, in a short speech close-packed with thought, underlining this "variety-in-unity" principle, pointed out that the Church differences which have survived into or developed in the twentieth century are not fortuitous or casual, but in a true sense providential; they were "meant

by God not to divide but to enrich," and without them the glory and honour of the nations cannot be brought into the Holy City. We have travelled a long way, the speaker reminded us, "from the idea which long prevailed in certain countries, and not least in that from which I come—that only those who think alike and worship according to the same forms can be fellow-members in the same Church. That conception of utter uniformity was impossible, and, I believe, unchristian. It was a narrow ideal, and it resulted in the multiplication of Churches divided only by narrow boundaries; whereas the conception that differences are meant for the enrichment of the Christian community has an enlarging effect."

Dr Barbour concluded on a practical note. "Much has necessarily been said in this Conference about unity of belief and doctrine; but it is good that other avenues to unity have not been forgotten. Especially have the representatives of the Swedish Church, Dr Lindskog at an earlier session and Archbishop Söderblom to-day, reminded us of the unity that comes through service and through worship; and to their testimony to the *communio in serviendo œcumenica*, and to the unity in worship experienced at Stockholm, I should like to add mine to the very memorable sense of unity which developed in one short week last August at Helsingfors among 1400 Young Men's Christian Association members gathered from 47 countries. In our present Conference more than one of the sections has already expressed its sense of the unity of the Church in service, prayer, and praise.

"As to unity through service—'the cup of cold water,' said Oliver Wendell Holmes, 'does not need to be translated for a foreigner to understand it.' And regarding unity in worship, we have two auxiliaries at hand which also are independent of translation and ought to form part of the language of the united Church—Music, and its complement: Silence."

Further speeches were contributed by Bishop Adolf Küry of the Old Catholics, Bishop Peter Hognestad of the Norwegian Lutheran Church, and Dr Gregor Pradese of the Church of Georgia, and then the section got to work. Members of this section, records one of them,[1] "had some experiences not anticipated in the Conference programme. Two of the groups were directed to meet in a chapel which proved somewhat hard to find. As they finally approached it by ones and twos from all points of the compass, they found the outer door hospitably open, but all inner doors firmly barred. The message warning the caretaker of their coming had gone astray; and as he could not be found, the groups moved off, after some hesitation, to the Cathedral. One of them held its conclave in the south transept, watched over by a mediæval group of four sculptured saints, bearing quaintly painted emblems. The members of the group subdued their voices in harmony with their solemn surroundings, but found that this great House of God was no unfitting place in which to try to think out some of the characteristics of the Christian community of the future.

[1] Dr R. F. Barbour.

"*Ex uno disce omnia.* This was a small group, but if its members are briefly described, the description may give some idea of the varied and composite character of the groups as a whole. The chairman, an American Doctor of Divinity, presided with a light and courteous hand, but when needful recalled the members firmly to the point at issue. On his left, a Swiss professor acted as interpreter between the language and the thought of German-speaking and English-speaking representatives. Next came the Dean of an Irish Cathedral. Then a professor (a Canadian Scot) who fulfilled the thankless duties of clerk with admirable patience, but whose handwriting quite baffled the Swedish brother who was called on to translate the group's conclusions into German two day's later. There were two other professors of theology, one from Germany, the other from Hungary, and a medical professor from Dublin, a member of the Society of Friends. There was a Swedish missionary, and a Norwegian Doctor of Law, who struggled manfully with the refractory English tongue, as he sought to explain to the group how intimately Church and State are allied in his native land, and how the former is entwined with the whole national life. There were two or three more—German, American, and Scots —whose characteristics have escaped the chronicler's memory. Finally, there was a famous missionary to the Moslem world, master of many tongues, who at once gave the discussion a practical bent by urging two things—first, that all Christians should prepare in their own hearts the soil of future unity by studying the best devotional literature of other

lands and Churches; and second, that the Conference should issue a clear call to unity in the foreign field, and that movements towards union there should not be held up by difficulties experienced in 'less happier lands' where divisions are old and deep-rooted.

"After two such sessions the groups were ready with their recommendations, and the whole section met to receive them in the German Church. It was situated near the top of a street even steeper than most of the streets of Lausanne. As one member, by no means a slow walker, pressed steadily up it, a well-knit figure shot past him—the chairman of the section, Archbishop Söderblom, who raced up the precipitous street with the energy of a boy of sixteen. Another aspect of the same remarkable vitality was shown by the chairman as soon as the section was constituted. He acted as precentor, giving a strong lead in the opening chorale. He contributed to the devotions a brief prayer in French and a Latin collect. He expounded the subject in English and German alternately; and he often relieved his countryman who acted as interpreter of a part of his arduous duties.

"It is hard to conduct an orderly discussion of a complex subject in a company of over a hundred men and women of strong convictions, even when there is unity of language. And if at times there was some confusion as the section discussed the draft report prepared by a small committee on the basis of the recommendations made by the five groups, the forbearance and patience shown was far more notable—especially was this patience

shown by the French- and German-speaking members, when amendments on the draft, suggestions and questions (most of them in English), followed one another so quickly that the interpreter could hardly find a chink of silence in which to exercise his office.

"Gradually, thanks to a real spirit of brotherliness and restraint, a definite ideal, and a possible line of approach to it, began to appear and to win general consent. Once in particular, after a vote had been taken on an important clause and had shown a grave divergence of opinion, and when in consequence the whole clause was in danger, a modification—small in itself—was suggested; both sides came together to accept it; and that section of the report to the Conference was adopted, as the Friends say, 'in unity.'

"In itself, the subject of Unity and Divergence in the Church was less controversial than certain others. But there was an opposite danger in the very largeness of the theme, and the scope which it gave to mere fluent and airy generalization. Two things helped to ward off this danger. First, the masterly address of the Bishop of Gloucester in the discussion which preceded in the full Conference, with its courageous plunge into prophecy and wealth of concrete suggestion; second, and almost more important, the actual experience of Church Union in Canada and elsewhere possessed by other speakers and members of the section.

"Thus, slowly and as it were by fits and starts rather than by a smooth, logical process, a way out of our present disunion began to appear. Federation was discussed, but was felt to be, not

a substitute for full Unity, but either a stage on the way to it, or at most a supplement to it—valuable especially in such efforts as those for international peace and for social reform. In these the Churches must co-operate, until the Church comes into being.

"But, when the one Church draws near it must have features different from any that we have yet known, or that we can as yet foresee in detail. It will be more than a federation, but it will have something of the flexible and adaptable character which we associate with the federal form. If it possesses a keen enough sense of its divine call and an eager enough determination to fulfil its missionary and reconciling task; if it is loyal enough to its Master, and responsive enough to the guidance of the Holy Spirit—then it may safely break away from old conceptions of rigid uniformity, and find room for a rich variety of thought and worship within its borders. For its unity will be secured less by organization than by enterprise, and less by dogma than by faith. It will show forth the unity, not of law but of love."

So ends the chronicler's report of what happened within the section. But despite the section's hard-won unanimity, and despite much travail over the text of its report (the author of this book was one of a small drafting committee which laboured at the wording to a very late hour of night), the report failed, for reasons indicated at the beginning of this chapter, to win the same degree of approval as had been accorded to the other six reports. Some members felt it travelled outside the limits of the subject; others that it was loosely worded,

and less impartial than the previous reports; others again pointed out that its suggested "essentials for unity" had not been, and owing to lack of time could not be, fully discussed by the Conference. The debate made it obvious that the Conference could not "receive" this report unanimously for transmission to the Churches, and it was, therefore, received only for reference to the Continuation Committee. That committee acted with great promptitude: it instructed a small group, with the Bishop of Gloucester at its head, to effect such a revision as should save the admittedly valuable parts of the work done, and meet the difficulties of those who felt bound to resist the reception of the report by the Conference. This work was taken in hand at once, and although the Conference would have been happy indeed if it could have taken unanimous action upon the work of all its sections, there is no one who would have wished it to come near breaking faith with its constituents by identifying itself with statements not unanimously received. The self-denying ordinance by which the seventh report was referred back was a moral victory of real value.

It is perhaps a pity that any of the work done at Lausanne—done for the most part with real care and devotion—should end in the waste-paper basket, and I propose therefore to rescue from oblivion the essentials for a United Church outlined in the section report—essentials which were, after all, mainly a summary of points on which the Conference had already found agreement, and which, as the Archbishop of Armagh reminded the Conference, bore a close resemblance to some of

the conclusions of the Lambeth Conference. The essentials are :—

(1) A common faith, a common message to the world.

(2) Baptism as the rite of incorporation into the one Church.

(3) Holy Communion, as expressing the corporate life of the Church and as its signal act of corporate worship.

(4) A Ministry accepted throughout the Universal Church.

(5) Freedom on interpretation about Sacramental grace and ministerial order and authority (there is a difference of view as to the extent of this freedom).

(6) Due provision for the exercise of the prophetic gift.

Through the courtesy of the Bishop of Gloucester I am able to append to this chapter a draft of the revised Report which his sub-committee have drawn up for presentation to the Continuation Committee. It must, however, be distinctly understood that the document printed below is a *draft only*, and has not as yet received the *imprimatur* of the Continuation Committee.

Draft for Revised Report of Subject VII

The Unity of Christendom in Relation to Existing Churches

In Reports II. to VI. we have registered the degree of unity in the conception of the Church

to which we have thus far attained. It remains in this closing report to consider the consequences which follow for the existing Churches.

I

In Report II. we record our agreement "that the message of the Church is and must always remain the Gospel of Jesus Christ, a message of redemption, both here and hereafter, the gift of God to man through Jesus Christ."

In Report III. we record our agreement "that God, who has given us the Gospel for the salvation of the world, has appointed His Church to witness by life and word to its redeeming power. . . . As there is but one Christ and one life in Him and one Holy Spirit who guides into all truth, so there is, and can be but one Church, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic."

In Report IV. we record our agreement that "notwithstanding the difference in doctrine among us, we are united in common Christian faith, which is proclaimed in the Holy Scriptures, and is witnessed to and safeguarded in the ecumenical creed commonly called the Nicean, and in the Apostles' Creed, which faith is continually confirmed in the spiritual experience of the Church of Christ."

In Report V. we record our agreement that "the ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church, and is essential to the being and well-being of this Church, its purpose being to impart to man the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ through pastoral service, the preaching of the

Gospel, and the administration of the Sacraments, to be made effective through faith."

In Report VI., we record our agreement that "Sacraments are of divine appointment, and that the Church ought thankfully to observe them as divine gifts; that they have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church, and that the grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ, and applying them to the soul by faith." Baptism is the rite of incorporation into the One Church, and Holy Communion at once expresses the corporate life of the Church and is its signal act of corporate worship.

II

The unity of the Church implies a unity in Faith and Order, but it does not mean uniformity. There must be space for divers types of expression, provided that those things which safeguard the unity in essentials are maintained. The various communions should bring into the common life of the Church those elements which express their characteristic *charismata*, so nothing of the rich variety which marks Christian experience will be lost, and the liberty of interpretation so highly prized by many Christian communions will be preserved.

Further, there are differences as to the ultimate form which it is God's will His Church should take. Some hold "that this form, having been determined by Christ Himself, is therefore unchangeable," and that this fact must, therefore, always determine the nature of creed, ministry,

and sacraments in the undivided Church. Others hold that "the one Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, may express itself in different forms," and, therefore, make place in their view of the Church of the future for greater diversity of doctrine, worship, and order.

This difference of ideal affects the view taken of the steps through which the ideal is to be reached. Those who take the former view interpret the limit of legitimate variation in doctrinal statement and in the administration of Church ordinances more strictly than those who take the latter view; but all of us agree that there must be some unity of faith and practice and some liberty of interpretation as to the nature of sacramental grace and of ministerial order and authority.

III

We agree that as the individual disciple is known by his fruits, so the unity of the disciples is shown by their fellowship in the service of the Master. In particular, "we agree that, pending the solution of the consideration of Faith and Order on which present agreement has not yet been reached, it is possible for us now, not only as individuals but as Churches, to unite in the activities of brotherly service which Christ has committed to His disciples"; but we differ as to the exact form this co-operation should take.

In his Encyclical Letter of 1920, the Ecumenical Patriarch proposed "that a league or council of the Churches should be formed for practical purposes." It has been suggested that such a

council might be evolved from already existing organizations, such as the Continuation Committee on Life and Work, consisting of representatives officially appointed by almost all the Christian communions, and other organizations of similar nature. Some of us believe that such a council if formed should include, as its two branches, questions of life and work and of faith and order. Others believe that, for the present, it would be wiser for the movements represented by Stockholm and Lausanne to develop in independence, each following its own way ; but we all agree that, in the last analysis, life, work, faith, and order are expressions of an existing spiritual unity, and that each requires the other for its complete fruition. " We therefore commend to the Churches the consideration of the steps which may be immediately practicable to bring our existing unity to more effective expression."

IV

As material for such consideration, we pass on to the Churches the following suggestions which, in the limits of our time, it was impossible adequately to discuss at Lausanne :—

(1) In preparation for closer fellowship, each section of the Church should seek more intimate knowledge of the faith and life, worship and order of the other communions. Differences which are the outgrowth of complicated historical developments may preserve some aspect of truth or of life which is of value to the Church as a whole, or they may sometimes prove to be less important than they are supposed to be. As the different com-

munions come to know one another better, they will cease to disparage, and strive rather to understand one another.

(2) It has not been possible for the Conference to consider with the care which it deserves the relation of the existing Churches to one another or the place which each or any of them may hold in the undivided Church. We commend to the Churches the suggestions which have been made on this subject in the addresses delivered at the Conference, especially such as have pointed out the possibility of union between different national Churches while they preserve differences in worship, in doctrinal expression, and in relation to the national life, or the possibility that religious societies with differences of custom and tradition might exist side by side with a national Church in the same area, provided that they agree in the fundamental essentials of faith and order. In the meantime, we welcome the movement already under way for the union of bodies of similar doctrine, polity, and worship, and trust that it may continue with ever greater success.

(3) Pending the complete organic union of the different Churches, we note with satisfaction a number of movements for practical co-operation along social, evangelistic, and other lines. Experience shows that it has been possible for widely separate bodies to co-operate in such movements with mutual profit and without surrender of principle. There is abundant evidence that when communions undertake together the divine task of bringing the love of Christ to those who do not know Him, they become closer to one another.

Especially we commend to the Churches the consideration of what steps can be taken to eliminate needless overlapping and competition in the local community; that either through the development of a parish system or in other ways consistent with the genius of the several communions, our existing unity in Christ may be manifest to the world.[1]

V

We note with gratitude to God the recent increase of effective co-operation in the Mission Field. The purpose of all missionary work is to carry the eternal Gospel to the ends of the earth, so that it may meet the spiritual needs of every nation and bring all men to the Saviour. Here more than anywhere else unity is essential. We note with sympathy the degree of union which has already been attained in many countries, and the plans which are proposed for further union. We commend these plans to the Churches for their careful consideration, with the prayer that God will speedily guide us into the full unity we seek.

VI

Complete fellowship in the Church will be realized only when the way is opened for all God's children to join in communion at the Lord's

[1] In the case of communions of similar doctrine and polity, the desired unity may often be brought about by the method of denominational comity. In the case of those communions which are separated by fundamental differences of view on these points, the problem is more difficult and will require special consideration.

Table. Through prayer and thoughtful deliberation the steps must be found which will most effectively lead to this goal. Ambiguous statements and hasty measures may hinder rather than hasten the work of unification. Yet if we are ever to become one, we must not shrink from the task. Some of us believe that full communion can only be reached at the end of the process of unification. Others that it may be used by God as the means to that end. Whatever the way to the goal, complete unity will require the full recognition of one another by members of all communions.

Nothing will do more to hasten the union for which we all long than that in our daily prayer, not only as individuals, but as Churches, each of us would remember the others. Especially[1] would we bear on our hearts before God our brethren who are passing through suffering, praying that grace may be given them to stand firm under their afflictions, and that to them and to us alike, God will grant the spirit of sacrifice as we remember the word of the Lord Jesus: "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross daily and follow Me." God give us, both as individuals and Churches, wisdom and courage to do His will.

[1] It has been suggested that a common prayer or collect to be used by all Christian Churches at Whitsuntide should be sent out on behalf of the Conference.

IX

NET GAINS

What did "Lausanne" really accomplish? A great many people have been asking that question. And different answers have been given, some optimistic and some the reverse. Those readers of this book who have persevered so far will have gathered the kind of answer that would be given by the present writer. I hazard the judgment—and this view is shared by many clear-sighted and far-seeing men who were at the Conference—that "Lausanne" will be reckoned by future Church historians to be perhaps the biggest step towards unity since the splitting of Christendom in the Middle Ages.

For, as the Bishop of Manchester said in a striking speech at the closing session, "the great thing about our Conference is that it has happened." "And," he added, "that is more important than any result that has been reached or would have been reached." For something like ten centuries Christian people in the world have taken divisions for granted. It is only in comparatively recent times that the tide has begun to set in the other direction, and that the separated Churches have begun, timidly, tentatively, to draw near to one another. "Lausanne" goes down to history as being the first large occasion on which the divided communions

have *officially* recognized this unity movement as a movement of God's Spirit, have met one another fraternally and talked together of "the things that belong unto their peace." And for that reason it constitutes, and will no doubt be increasingly recognized as, a great landmark in the history of the Christian Church.

It is significant, too, to find that so many of those who were at Lausanne use deliberately the word "miracle" in recording their impressions of the Conference. "There were many of us," writes the editor of the *Review of the Churches*,[1] "who went to Lausanne with profound misgivings, but we now realize how marvellously the Spirit of God breathed upon the troubled waters of our religious differences. As we view what God has wrought in our Assembly we can only declare, 'It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.'" "The mere fact of the Conference taking place," comments another delegate, a leading American Baptist,[2] "borders on the miraculous. When one realizes the traditions back of all these many types of ecclesiasticism, the precious heritages they have sacredly received as a trust to be perpetuated, the denominational consciousness which each has kept alive with persistent propaganda and eager faith, one wonders that we could all sit down together so earnestly and face the facts so dispassionately. It was a great thing to hear men of many different tongues join in such a hymn as 'All hail the power of Jesus' Name,' but it was a far greater

[1] Sir Henry Lunn in the issue of October 1927.

[2] The Rev. Ivan Murray Rose, Minister of the First Baptist Church, Philadelphia.

thing to watch these responsible representatives of these many faiths sit down for days in the close and laboured study of just how the Church of Jesus might proceed in the direction of Reunion."

"Some of our members," the Bishop of Gloucester told the Conference, speaking for the whole of his section, "said they had come to this Conference uncertain as to what to expect, and perhaps not even expecting very much, and that they had found themselves sharing in a notable spiritual experience. We found that this was true of the entire membership of the section, and it therefore followed that we should give it expression in making our report. The first paragraph is, therefore, an attempt to state quite simply and sincerely that we were conscious of God with us."

This common sense of God, this unshatterable certainty that we were drawing our life from the one Lord and Master and were embarked together on the adventure of making Him King over all the earth, underlay all our work, inspired all our informal intercourse, and found expression again and again in our common devotions. For some of us perhaps this sense of spiritual oneness was most clearly in our consciousness at a particularly moving Service of Penitence and Intercession in the Cathedral on the second Sunday of the Conference. It was a relief, then and there, in a simple liturgy printed in the three languages, to pour out our souls before God and, as the bidding enjoined us, "To come boldly to the throne of grace, with true penitence for the past, with new hope for the future, with eyes open to see the salvation of the Lord."

After all, this sense of vital spiritual unity is, as we found at Lausanne, a prerequisite of any satisfactory theological discussion. It is only when you know, intuitively and instinctively, that at bottom your faith is the same as the other man's, that you have—and he has—the desire to interpret it in some theological formula which might be generally acceptable. This process was characteristic of "Lausanne." The practical result of that deep and common sense of God, referred to above, was a powerful will to unity and a genuine desire to understand and discover new spiritual treasures lying beneath unfamiliar religious forms. "The spirit of synthesis," wrote the *Guardian* correspondent,[1] "is alive among us, and it is quite genuinely not the spirit of compromise, but something far deeper." "The thing which made the Conference delightful above measure to me," testifies an "Anglo-Catholic" who worked manfully for harmony in what he must have felt was a predominantly "Protestant" atmosphere,[2] "was its comradeship and contacts, purposeful, social, spiritual. There were clashes, controversies, and conflicts of opinion in plenty, but they were always chivalrous. Mutual goodwill and tolerance ruled everything. There were disappointments, but they were taken in charity and there was never a regrettable incident. All through we were 'a happy band of brothers.' And the Conference will long remain a fruitful exemplar of the constructive manner in which fundamentally contrasted religious diversities should and can be discussed."

[1] *Guardian*, 12th August 1927.

[2] Canon J. A. Douglas, the *Christian East*, October 1927.

"Each day," confessed another delegate, "has enlarged my vision, and I have been lifted to heights I had no conception of. I must have been very narrow." [1] To quote Mr I. M. Rose again, "Men did not go ungallantly about, pressing forward with their aggravating distinctives; they humbly sought to thank God that so much for which the fathers had died in the days of desperate antagonisms had now become the universal possession and appreciation of all the Church."

Even the *Church Times* representative, normally disposed to reflect the coldly critical attitude of his paper towards most Reunion movements, was constrained to bear witness that—

"Behind and beside all the clashes which occurred and the differences which were revealed in the Conference, its members were possessed by a wonderful solidarity in the great essential—faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Whatever risks and dangers were involved in the Conference, its result would seem to have been governed by the Holy Spirit; and if those who shared in its experiences have to learn that the goal of Reunion is not to be obtained swiftly and *per saltum* they have also been inspired wonderfully to value and to love each other as self-dedicated to a common task and to a common Saviour."

And this kind of testimony could be multiplied almost indefinitely. The truth is that, as many of us felt at the time, the only explanation of all this "miracle" was the great volume of prayer which had been going up for the Conference in many lands for many years.

[1] *Student Movement*, October 1927.

Not least among the many evidences of a tone and temper which were surely inspired was the way in which the Conference faced and handled its disagreements. As has been recorded already, there was no attempt to burke differences, nor was the Conference unmindful of the danger, eloquently insisted on by the Carlyle-looking German theologian, Dr Titius, of trying to cover up large and serious cracks with the thin paper of ambiguous formulæ. "The Conference," said *The Times*, in one of its able leading articles,[1] "gave evidence of its determination not to accept anything which appeared to signify agreement where in fact it did not exist."

The deep and formidable differences existing in the Conference were sharply manifested in the "Statement" which the Orthodox representatives felt obliged to make at one point—a statement occasioned in the first instance by the discussions on the Sacraments. On 17th August the Metropolitan Germanos, speaking on behalf of the representatives of the Eastern Orthodox Church, presented a statement to the Conference, in which he and his associates declared that, while in hearty sympathy with the purposes of the Conference, they nevertheless found themselves unable to vote on any of the section reports except one, "The Message of the Church." They had concluded with regret that the bases assumed for the foundation of the reports were inconsistent with the principles of the Orthodox Church. The most they could do, therefore, would be to enter into co-operation with the Christian Churches in

[1] 17th August 1927.

the social and moral sphere on a basis of Christian life.

The statement made the Conference feel uncomfortable. But a wise and firm handling of the situation from the chair helped us all to get the whole incident into a right perspective. Bishop Brent pointed out that "The delegates were met for Conference, 'on things in which we agree and things on which we differ,' and that the Eastern Orthodox group had had every opportunity to state their differences in sectional meetings." He thanked the Orthodox representatives for the frank way in which they had declared their position, and expressed the hope that they would give the same consideration to the position of those who differed from them as the other delegates are prepared to give to the convictions of the Eastern Orthodox group. He pointed out that the Orthodox statement indicated in no sense a withdrawal from the Conference. "They do not wish to stand apart from their brethren," he said, "but obeying their conscience they have done a hard thing with grace."

It would be a mistake to over-emphasise the significance of this Orthodox *démarche*. For many years now they have been drawing steadily closer to the Anglican Church—their official participation in 1925 in the Anglican commemoration of the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicæa was a striking ecclesiastical event; and they are becoming increasingly affected by the main currents of the life of Christendom. Their action at Lausanne—so it seemed to some of us at the time—was to say, in effect, "We are coming along as

fast as we can in all this unity movement, but please don't force the pace, or we shall have to drop out!" There are many of the younger Orthodox members, partly through Student Movement contacts, who are quite ready for the quicker pace; but there can be little doubt that the great bulk of the Church has so far remained largely untouched by the thinking done in Western Europe during the last half century. And those who know best how faithfully the Orthodox Church has maintained its faith and its witness in lands where the environment is anything but Christian, also realize keenly that they have shown a certain tendency to "fossilize round the dogmatic precipitates of the great theological controversies," and in that process to lose spiritual vitality and moral power. "A recovery of the balance here," writes a delegate who has had long and intimate experience of the near East,[1] "and mutual understanding between East and West at this point would be worth the whole Conference and immeasurably more: so far as these views have been exchanged they are an approach to, or a preparation for, further intellectual and spiritual understanding. A flash of light was thrown on this subject by Bishop Temple's great short address in the Cathedral (on 10th August). He headed the series of losses which the Church had sustained by acts of disunion, by the riving of the Jewish Church from the Church of Christ. This exposed the Church, during the formulative period of its creed, to the full force of the Greek national element within it, without any adequate repre-

[1] The Rev. Maurice Richmond, of the Y.M.C.A., Cairo.

sentation of the characteristic Jewish religious genius. Had there been a strong representation of the Jewish religious mind at Nicæa and Chalcedon, it is unlikely that the Church would have formed its creed with the emphasis left undisturbedly dogmatic, without the great moral emphasis being sounded at all."

This action on the part of the Orthodox rather tended to start an infection of "statement making" on the part of groups and individuals. A distinguished "Anglo-Catholic" layman felt it necessary to express his own personal approval of what the Orthodox representative had done. But there was general relief, and loud applause from all quarters of the hall, when the Bishop of Bombay, speaking on behalf of practically all the Anglicans at the Conference, declared that they felt it quite unnecessary and uncalled for to make any "statement" before the Conference; they—the Anglicans—"hoped to work for many years towards a better apprehension of the truth of God as it is offered to the universal Church, and to put behind them every kind of sectional opinion." Thus steadied, the Conference resumed its examination of the sections' reports, and began to ascend again to the level of harmony from which it had temporarily declined.

This chapter, in its attempt to estimate some of the main difficulties and to sum up the chief gains of Lausanne, may not unfitly conclude with the evidence of three very different witnesses. The first, an able and eminent professor who prefers to remain anonymous, supplies information and indicates a point of view which were liable to

escape the notice of Anglo-Saxon delegates. After adding his testimony to the wonderful atmosphere and remarkable achievements of the Conference, the Professor continues: "I write as a Lutheran, and as a member of the Swedish Church, whose attitude in some ways is a bit different from our German, and still more American brethren. The Swedish Church, of course, has been prepared for entering into the Reunion movement mainly through the Stockholm Conference of 1925. It would perhaps be true to say that many of us—and even more so the Germans—have felt from the beginning a certain scepticism as regards 'Faith and Order,' while 'Life and Work' seemed to be a much more hopeful line of approach. On the other hand, the Orthodox pietism in the North has been rather more favourably inclined towards 'Faith and Order,' while distrusting 'Life and Work' as an attempt to meddle in God's own job. Yet I think it is true to say, that most Swedes, and many Germans got much more out of Lausanne than they hoped—mostly because of the moderate line that prevailed, and through the unfailing courtesy of the leaders in their attempt to do justice to all points of view, and to spare troubled consciences. To all, of course, it became a grand and inspiring experience. But I am not going to dwell on this fairly obvious side. I think it may be more profitable to set out a few critical observations—which, of course, do not imply a denial of the great fact of the Conference as a great event, and perhaps a new beginning.

"The main problem and difficulty for the Lutherans at Lausanne was perhaps the fact that

the planning of the Conference, the definition of the problems, and the preparatory work all through bore the stamp of the Anglo-Saxon origin of the movement, and to a large extent presupposed the religious situation in England and America, and took for granted the current ideas of English theology. Many of the Lutheran delegates from Germany and Scandinavia found themselves confronted with new questions, which they had not now the time to consider maturely, and with some questions which they would be prone to regard as misleading; for example, all talk of 'the faith once delivered to the saints' would seem to them to presuppose a static conception of faith as a number of dogmatic statements to be swallowed whole, while their whole training had led them to think of faith as primarily something which concerned the heart even more than the reason. Now, of course, it was immensely valuable that these two conceptions should be confronted with each other —just as at Stockholm two widely different ideas of the Kingdom of God were brought together. This was perhaps one of the most important features of the Conference, the confrontation of the Lutheran and the Anglican views. But it was a pity that this confrontation should not have begun during the preparation for the Conference. The material prepared and put into the hands of delegates must seem to many Lutherans very one-sided. There were also other reasons for a certain dissatisfaction on the part of many, mostly Germans, during the first part of the Conference—the preponderance of the English language and of American parliamentary procedure made it sometimes rather

difficult for those who did not speak English to get a real hearing. Oh, those discussions of procedure, in which Americans delight! These are, I think, mainly the facts behind the Lutheran declaration contained in the minutes. Perhaps I may claim that the Swedish delegation on more than one occasion was a useful intermediary between the German and the English elements, mostly through the influence of the Archbishop of Upsala, but also because some other members of it were able to see something of both sides and converse freely in both languages."

My second witness is Bishop Gore; and this chapter and book would be seriously incomplete without some reference to the masterly account of the Conference which he contributed to *The Times* of 24th August 1927. After speaking of the substantial agreements discovered and recorded at the Conference, the Bishop continues: "On this basis of common agreement room must be found for very considerable diversities of faith and practice; and the reunited Church must be large and comprehensive enough to contain all the treasures of experience which have given their strength to the various non-episcopal communities. Here, I think, we get to the heart of the matter. The Conference will bear fruit exactly in proportion as those it represents acknowledge that true Catholicism is wider and more comprehensive than anything embodied in any single communion; or, more generally, that there is a true witness borne by the different Protestant communities which Catholicism as commonly understood needs for its own sake and has in history failed to realize, and

on the other hand, that Protestantism needs to make its own what has been the strength and glory of Catholicism. The real question is—Will the different communions deliberately set themselves to acknowledge their own limitations and encourage themselves in the recognition that the true Catholicism, or the true Christianity, is something larger and richer than any one of the existing traditions? This will involve a great effort—for example, on the part of the Orthodox Churches of the East of or the Protestant communions of Europe and America: but we believe it is an effort which the best men of all the separated communions are prepared to make; and what they have to do is to educate their own people. Dr Garvie made a very noticeable contribution to our discussions when he said, speaking on behalf of those who have a horror of authoritative creeds, that they had need to realize how much the creedless Churches owed to the Catholic creeds for the maintenance of the Scriptural faith. But there were so many of the delegates from Protestant communions in Europe and America who acknowledged almost total ignorance of the Nicene Creed, and told us in private conversation that their flocks, in the light of historical experiences, regarded Episcopacy with almost unmitigated horror, that we could not fail to understand how great would be the effort that would be needed for the realization of our ideal."

After some further illuminating observations the Bishop has an interesting comment on the mediatory position of the Anglican communion. "An Anglican," he says, "may be pardoned for noticing

that though the Anglican representatives, as usual, made no secret of their differences and were kindly 'chaffed' in consequence, though they declined to follow the example of many other communions and make statements embodying the Anglican mind on the different questions, and though they spoke their own minds with less fear of those from among whom they came than some others in the Conference, yet there was a fresh appreciation by many, to whom Anglicanism was almost a new idea, that after all the Anglican Church was the 'Brücke-kirche' — the 'Bridge-Church' — which had a special part to play in bringing Catholicism and Protestantism together."

My third and last witness is Professor Vernon Bartlet, who contributes the following memorandum on the Conference:—

"When one tries to sum up the effect and meaning of the Lausanne Conference on Faith and Order, the extraordinary difficulty of the task grows with the effort to grasp even one's own personal impressions of it as a whole, let alone that of others' feelings it was possible to gather at the time. It was so big, so many-sided, above all so living. So much at least is certain: its spirit was right, truly world-wide in its outlook and sympathy, and profondly Christian, because instinct with love for God and man. True, the largest of the sections of the Church universal was absent by its own conscientious choice; but it was not forgotten, and its potential place in the distant future of the Reunion movement was allowed for and kept open. In any case the realities of the general world-situation alike in Christendom

and on the Mission Field were never absent from our thoughts, binding us together and urging us on to sacrifice points of preference rather than conscience, with a view to making manifest in the short time at our disposal the full extent of our common ground as members of the one Church, our Lord's Body, the organism through which primarily His distinctive life and will are by divine vocation to take effect in this world. Nor was the world of the future—youth, with its quick pulses and near horizons—really forgotten, though its point of view is referred to explicitly only here and there in our reports.

"So much for the spirit and attitude of the Conference. For this at least all of us may thank God and take courage, since no body of men could thus join, amid all differences of training and temperament, in practically saying, 'Jesus is Lord' of us all, and of all we hold dear, 'but by the Spirit of God.' What, however, of the letter of its doings, represented by the reports drawn up in common and passed on for the consideration of the various communions which sent delegates? Their general nature and purpose is admirably indicated in the Preamble[1] written by our chairman, Bishop Brent, who throughout embodied the real soul and mind of all at their best. It is in the light of this Preamble that this must steadily be judged. But so regarded, then, how far may they be adjudged satisfactory or as justifying the labour from first to last expended on this Conference? All here depends on a knowledge and just estimate of the many and diverse traditions, each with its

[1] See pp. 33, 34.

own interpretation of Christianity and its own relative emphasis on values held in common, which had to find expression in these reports, if they were really to reflect the facts of the present situation and prepare the way for their transformation into a higher and more inclusive synthesis of all the diverse values for the life of the Church as a whole.

" In the process of framing our findings we were, I think, all made to realize more deeply how much history and historically developed convictions lived in us and those we were representing ; and this in itself was a liberal education, when viewed in the light of a common belief in the Spirit of God as having been at work in that history, and in the consciences which prized and lived by the differing aspects of the full Christian truth it reflected. This being so, it is surely not too much to hope that the effect of a perusal of reports drawn up in such an atmosphere of mutual regard for each other's consciences, as well as for one's own, will also be of the nature of a *liberalizing and enlarging education for our respective communions*, if only they read them in a like spirit. The one fatal thing would be that those who sent their delegates discounted the reports from the first simply because they are not *on other lines*. It is certainly possible, as many of us have doubtless been feeling all too strongly since they were fixed beyond recall, that they might have been far better, if only we had had more time in the intimate religious and mental fellowship of the several sections and groups, where we got to the positive aspects of positions other than our own, seen from the inside through the eyes of men we felt to be our souls' brethren. But

that does not mean either that the lines followed were without high value, expressing as they did strong vital instincts working within us in a right atmosphere, or that a more careful adjustment of the findings, both of agreement and difference, into formal harmony would have been more instructive at this stage and so more helpful to the final issue, true unity on the basis of mutual understanding and sympathy. It may well be that, in both these respects, by yielding rather to the lines of tendency dominant in an atmosphere charged with the spirit of brotherly love in Christ and mutual reverence for conscience, the Conference 'builded better than it knew.' That at least is my present faith and hope.

"Granting, then, that our work furnishes *materials for getting closer together* on the basis of actually existing religious values, both of agreement and difference, rather than actual lines of harmonizing theory, I remain satisfied that a great opportunity has not been lost by human shortcomings and mistakes, while God was so manifestly among us with His moral Gifts of the Spirit, and especially with 'that most excellent Gift of Charity.' In any case I trust that the reports will be studied *as wholes*, and as parts of a larger whole, approached through the Preamble. They are not meant to be analysed paragraph by paragraph, still less dissected into sentences read and quoted apart from their context, on which depends what of their essential spirit can be conveyed on paper, a spirit of mutually supplemental Catholicity of experience. Read in the spirit and atmosphere out of which they came, they will surely suggest some aspects of the Gospel

and its embodiment in the Church's life and institutions to which most have been, alike as individuals and as Churches, too insensitive in the past, and, therefore, cold to the claims of wider unity in diversity. The real test of the immediate success or failure of the Conference will be the reception of its reports by the Churches concerned. Will they remain dead letters to them; or will they become a challenge and stimulus to further study of what keeps us all from realizing a larger fellowship of faith and worship, such as was plainly experienced at Lausanne?

"I pass, finally, to consider in particular the probable reaction of the English Free Churches to the call for increased interest in manifest Church Unity, which this Conference makes to them amongst others.

"Much here depends on the degree to which they approach the reports in the way above indicated, not regarding them as if meant to be final statements, nor as offering theories either of the common affirmations of faith or of the diversities of conception as to *how* God vouchsafes the experiences on which those affirmations rest. Still less should they ask anxiously why this or that point of emphasis dear to this or that part of the one Church, in its present separated state, has not been more clearly 'vindicated' over against some other belief, in the traditional or popular statement of which they believe, perhaps rightly, much error of conception to be present. The answer to this tacit query is that this was not the job for which the Conference assembled It was for truer and fairer mutual understanding all round, as a first

step to following up the results, both of unity and diversity, with more sympathetic and unprejudiced study in the same atmosphere as prevailed at the Conference.

"As regards its findings on points of acute difference, I would refer my fellow Free Churchmen to a sentence in the Report on Sacraments, one of the most diversive of topics. 'In this connection we recognize that the Sacraments have special reference to the corporate life and fellowship of the Church, and that the Grace is conveyed by the Holy Spirit, taking of the things of Christ and applying them to the soul through Faith.' Here we have a good specimen of the combination of aspects which have often been recognized one-sidedly in our separated state. The frank valuation of the corporate aspect of the Gospel, which has come with an enlarged and deepened conception of personality as social and not only individual, has made Free Churchmen far readier than they would have been a generation ago to do justice to the institutional side of Church life; just as 'Catholics,' on their part, are readier to do justice to the personal and experimental aspects of the Holy Spirit and of Faith (as distinct from 'the Faith'). All the reports should be read with these great principles constantly in view, the principles of the 'Evangelical Catholicity' that is to be.

"Certain special groups put in declarations making clear their attitude to the various reports —the Orthodox, the Lutherans, the French-speaking Reformed, and the Friends. Perhaps these words from the last but one may be quoted

as anticipating what in these reports and in the Conference's proceedings generally will most awake an answering chord in the British Free Churches.

"'Whatever be the importance of the efforts made to translate its unanimity into definite written expression, they [the Reformed] regard the historic significance of the Conference as residing above all in the fact that the Churches have shown themselves resolved to seek henceforth the basis of their unity in the Person of their Master and Saviour, placed deliberately above their particular creeds as the supreme object of faith. . . . May the Grace of God, who has allowed us to take the first steps towards the visible unity of Christ's Church, bring it about also that the Conference of Lausanne may mark the end of dissensions and of anathemas between Christian Churches!'"

X

"WHAT NEXT?"

I

"LAUSANNE" has come and gone. What is to come of it? An exact answer to that query is, in the nature of the case, impossible. All that can be said is that we who were present at the Conference left it with an unshakable conviction that it was a beginning and not an end; and we endeavoured so to shape and solidify our work that it should be strong to carry the next storey of the unity building whenever that should be added. In this chapter an attempt will be made to describe the kind of plans the Conference outlined for the future, and to indicate the general lines along which, in the judgment of many of us who were at Lausanne, the unity movement may develop in the years to come.[1]

At one of the closing sessions—after a richly deserved vote of thanks to hard-working secretaries and stenographers, who had laboured sometimes all through the night in order to have documents ready for the next day's Conference—a large,

[1] For the opinions expressed in the present chapter the writer is solely responsible, though he has reason to think that these opinions are shared by many Lausanne delegates as well as by other Christians.

strong, and representative Continuation Committee was appointed, with a membership comprising many who were on the old Continuation Committee, together with a useful infusion of new blood, and representatives of all the larger communions. The old officers continue: Bishop Brent (Chairman), Dr Garvie (Vice-chairman), Mr George Zabriskie (Treasurer), and Mr Ralph W. Brown (Secretary). Its British members[1] include the Bishop of Gloucester, the Bishop of Bombay, Sir Henry Lunn, Dr Ross Stevenson, Canon Bate, Canon Tatlow, Dr Carnegie Simpson, and the present writer. The main business of the Committee at the moment is to send the findings of the Conference to all the participating Churches through their official channels, and to ask the Churches to report back to the Committee the result of their deliberations upon these findings; after which it will be for the Committee to consider if, and what kind of, steps should be taken for the holding, many years hence, of another World Conference.

II

Meantime, the next, the most important, and the most urgent step is that "Lausanne" and all it means for the Reunion movement should be broadcasted throughout the rank and file of the whole Christian Church, North, South, East, and West. It needs saying quite plainly that one of the biggest obstacles to Church unity is to be found in the apathy and ignorance of the

[1] For complete list of the Committee, see Appendix, p. 189.

ordinary Churchman and Churchwoman. Until that apathy is shaken and that ignorance enlightened, the Reunion cause is doomed to tarry. The gap between leaders and followers has grown too wide. It is, of course, clear that Reunion cannot be achieved without conference and negotiation between responsible persons acting for the Churches. But it is also clear that such negotiation must remain barren and profitless unless behind it there is the dynamic of a vigorous and rational will to unity on the part of the rank and file of Christendom. The decisions and agreements of Lausanne will go for little until they rest upon the convinced support of the great body of Church members. The story of the Council of Florence, when the Eastern dignitaries of the Orthodox Church met the Latins in the fifteenth century, arrived at a *concordat*, and returned to Constantinople, to be stoned in the streets, is a warning that must never be forgotten in the days that follow all such gatherings as took place at Lausanne.[1]

Therefore the next step, now that the Conference is over, is to take all that "Lausanne" has stood for and make sure that it penetrates the mind and conscience of the vast, world-wide constituency that was represented there. The time is ripe to-day for a prophetic summons to the whole Church to arouse itself and end the scandal of disunion. Some one has said that at Lausanne there were too many delegates from the middle of the road, and that no prophet ever came from the middle of the road. Whether or

[1] Cf. *Review of the Churches*, October 1927, p. 432.

no "Lausanne" can produce them, there is no doubt that prophets are needed to make men see the sin of our divisions, and hear the call of God to follow the way of fellowship. Reunion is not just something desirable if it may be had; it is a *sine quâ non* if the Church is to do her work properly. The thing is urgent. The world, shattered by the War, bewildered, divided, yet physically unified as never before, needs a Gospel of Unity. The Church, Christ's Society, is entrusted, and knows it is entrusted, with that Gospel; but it cannot preach it with power as long as it fails to live it. If to-day men are to discover Christ and to try His way in the world, letting go their suspicions and healing their hatreds, they must be able to see that way in all its splendour convincingly demonstrated in the family life of a united Church. For lack of this fellowship God is, it would seem, deprived of an instrument which is essential to His purposes. And the lack of that instrument is our fault, not His. It is nothing but our own blindness and selfishness and pride, our own gross contentment with things as they are, that prevents the Church from being in any effective sense the Body of Christ. "For in a world like ours God can only manifest Himself in the framework of the material. When Heaven came to earth it chose for its framework such dull, prosaic things as a manger in a crowded inn yard, a cottage home at Nazareth, a carpenter's bench, a company of dull-witted men whose ideas were chained to the things of the world, and, finally, an executioner's gibbet on a green hill far away. Nothing could be more unemotional or unromantic,

yet it was the framework of the life of God. This is precisely what the Church should be."

These things ought, I dare to say, to be shouted from the housetops until men begin to listen. Above all, for the sake of the future, it is to be hoped that *youth* will hear and understand. Many of the younger ones in the Churches are, as they may well be, impatient of the utterly antiquated causes of our present disunion. And on them will fall the main and the final task of building a reunited Church. They were, perhaps inevitably, absent from Lausanne. The Conference was a grey-headed one on the whole. "I heard of one student," records Canon Tatlow, "brought into the meetings while there was a discussion going on about what might be done during the next twenty years, and I am told his comment was—'I wanted to get up and say, "By Gosh, in fifteen years you'll all be dead."'" However, when they do take up the task seriously, the new generation ought to find the ground well cleared. The whole atmosphere with regard to unity has undergone a complete change from what it was at the end of last century or even the beginning of this. Sir Henry Lunn, the originator of the Grindelwald Conferences, has placed it on record that the saintly Dr Perowne, Bishop of Worcester, because at the Grindelwald Conference he had welcomed leaders of other communions to the Sacrament of Love, when he appeared to preside at the Church Congress of 1892, was greeted with cries of "Hypocrite" and "Traitor."[1] Thirty years later the Lambeth Conference was definitely to sanction such action

[1] *Review of the Churches*, October 1927, p. 426.

as that which drew such denunciations on the head of that Bishop.

III

Although, as was shown in Chapter IX, the Conference deliberately refrained from any attempt categorically to specify conditions of Reunion, it is not difficult to deduce from the Conference's recorded agreements some suggestive outlines and features of the Church-that-is-to-be. Of the Americans at the Conference it was said that they had amongst them a conviction "so far-reaching as to amount to an unarguable assumption, that the future is the only thing that matters, whereas we in Europe are deeply rooted in the past." I think it is true to say that the Conference generally, despite inherited divisions of enormous strength, did catch something of the American freshness and hope, and did look forward with unclouded vision to a new Church Unity which should transcend anything which history has so far shown. Evidence of this mighty hope appears again and again in the speeches and addresses, and, if you read between the lines, in the reports themselves.

What this hope means, in all its many-sidedness, I will not attempt to recapitulate here; this whole book seeks to show the stuff it is made of. In these closing pages, I will only pick out for emphasis two things. One is that "Lausanne" reaffirmed unmistakably what "Lambeth, 1920," saw and asserted so clearly, that the chief feature of the United Church, when it comes, will be *Unity with variety*. A flat, dull, rigid uniformity

is as undesirable as it is impossible. What is contemplated is a great family circle, in which all groups, "Catholic," "Protestant," and any other, with all their gifts and idiosyncrasies, so far as they are in accordance with the mind of Christ, would find a place. In such an organism, alive, and, therefore, showing variation, each group would have large liberty for its own emphasis on doctrine, its own methods of worship, its own polity, its own discipline: in fact, the largest liberty which is consistent with the fundamentals of the whole fellowship. "Such a plan"—I quote some words of my brother's[1]—"would be free from the rigidity of amalgamation and the looseness of federation. It would manifest the essential characteristics of human life. For here would be a society which, while it would curb the extravagance of the individual Church, would jealously guard its liberty and enhance its personality. At the same time the individual Church, mindful of the glory of membership in the Catholic society, and realizing itself far more truly within its borders than it ever could in the isolation of complete independence, would find its highest ambition in bringing its best to the common weal. This, I believe, is the only kind of unity worth real sacrifice. . . . A true Catholicism is the world's greatest need, and unless the Catholic Church can find means of including all that is true in the devotion and activity of the separated Churches of the last three hundred years it will remain impoverished and inadequate for its world task."

Such mutual enrichment, such common contri-

[1] *Interpreters of God*, by the Bishop of Winchester, p. 53.

buting of all treasures of faith and order, will be achieved—let it be plainly said—by sacrifice and not by compromise. Sacrifice of sub-Christian, or non-Christian, superfluities: "Without all controversy," said Bishop Stillingfleet in the seventeenth century,[1] "the main inlet of all the distractions, confusions, and divisions of the Christian Church has been the adding of other conditions of Church connection than Christ Himself hath done." And sacrifice of status, superiority, prestige. "Christian reconciliation," Dr Orchard has pointed out,[2] "does not mean gathering around the table for a nice comfortable talk in order that a way of compromise may be found; Christian reconciliation is not a mere soother of irritated feelings; it is not an ingenious compromise; it is something that has to be secured by sacrifice, and the sacrifice has to be first set forth by the superior party and then followed by others."

The other thing that emerged very plainly from the Lausanne proceedings is that, in working for a United Church in the future, the divided Church of to-day must be prepared not only to tolerate but to welcome *a period of experiment*, both in the older lands of Christendom and among the new-born Churches growing up in other parts of the world. For the Churches of Africa and the East the unity problem is one of daily and pressing urgency, and they cannot afford to wait indefinitely while the Churches of the West

[1] Quoted by a delegate in one of the Conference sessions.

[2] Quoted by H. R. L. Sheppard, *The Impatience of a Parson*, p. 42.

make up their mind.[1] "Bishop Azariah and Dr Lew," observes Mr Basil Matthews, "were the living symbols at Lausanne of half the human race waiting for the vision of a united Christendom; the personal expression at the Conference of Christ's young Churches in ancient Asia; the spokesmen of races on whom the future of the world depends; the ambassadors of eight hundred million people for whom Christ died." "Mohammedanism," says Mr Roome in his recent book on Africa,[2] "presents to heathenism a united front—Christianity is broken into factions. Behind Islam there is the driving force of an intense realization of one fact—'There is no God but Allah, and Mohammed is His Prophet!' The power behind Christianity seems sometimes to be only the desire of one faction to supplant another." So it is sober truth to say that the Church in the Mission Field *must* find the way to unite; the alternative is disastrous failure. And the Church abroad looks for, and ought to receive, sympathetic guidance from the Church at home, and encouragement to make experiments in unification. The outstanding example at the moment of such experimenting comes from South India, where prolonged and careful discussions are in progress between the South India United Church (constituted in 1908 by the union of five separate Missions in South India) and representatives of the Anglican Communion and of the ancient Syrian Church of South India. Such a union would unite three Churches, representing Western Catholic, Eastern Catholic, and Free Protestant Churches. If

[1] *Cf.* Chapter III., pp. 41-49. [2] *Can Africa be Won?*

achieved, it would be the first union in history between East and West, Catholic and Protestant, episcopal and non-episcopal.[1]

IV

Mr G. K. Chesterton has given somewhere this epigrammatic advice: "If you want to make a thing living, make it local." That seems to me a good motto for all throughout the whole Church, leaders and rank and file, who desire to forward the Reunion movement during the next few years. Negotiations "at the top" will in any case continue, and will no doubt be stimulated by the official reception and discussion on the part of the Churches of the Lausanne Reports. But the most important thing of all is that the members of the different Churches should make a serious attempt to get to know and understand one another, to work together in the common Christian cause, and to discover and enjoy their fundamental unity in Christ. When men do that, then they come instinctively to believe in a United Church; and when there are enough Christians to believe in a United Church, it will swiftly come into being.

But this process of learning to understand and to co-operate is best carried out locally and territorially. A good deal along this line (I am thinking at the moment only in terms of England) has been and is being done, but there are vast areas of Church life remaining quite untouched. There are still too many Anglicans who think of

[1] Cf. *Review of the Churches*, October 1927, p. 539.

"Dissenters" as strange beings professing an alien religion, and too many Free Churchmen who take it for granted that the religion of the Anglican is either fossilized through its connection with the State, or doctrinally dangerous and leading straight towards Rome. The absurd and grotesque misconceptions of each other's religion entertained by religious people living even in the same street, can only be effectively removed by discovering, through personal contact, that the other man is both a human being and a thoroughly good Christian. Such contacts ought to be made regularly, and in many different directions—through, for instance, local conferences, or joint meetings of Church Councils, or joint services for two congregations of different denominations, as well as through the now widely established "fraternals" for clergy and ministers. All these methods have been tried and have worked successfully. Many places nowadays have, also, some permanent United Council of all the Churches for the purpose of focussing and expressing Christian public opinion in matters affecting the welfare of the community. All such co-operation in "Life and Work" prepares the ground for the richer unity in "Faith and Order." Of recent years, too, a good deal of successful evangelistic work has been planned and carried out on joint lines, such as the great Ipswich Town Mission of 1921, the large-scale Industrial Christian Fellowship Crusades, and the campaigns manned by students from the Universities. As one who has had much to do with many of these campaigns and crusades, I should like to bear my witness to their powerful

effect in demonstrating and promoting Christian Unity. When men preach Christ together at the street corner to a crowd of non-churchgoers, they know they are fellow-soldiers in Christ's army, and that their common experience of the same Christ is of infinitely greater moment than their differing views of Church order.

A Christian leader in the near East[1] draws a picture—based largely on actual fact—of the kind of effect such *joint* evangelism would produce in a non-Christian land, in a city where many races meet. "The Anglicans would bring one or two of their most experienced Mission preachers, from England or elsewhere, to hold special missions to convert, reclaim, and upbuild their English community; the Greek Orthodox would bring their most saintly and powerful preachers, be they monk, priest, or evangelist, for their congregation; the American Missions, who in many cases do this annually, would be invited to synchronize their evangelistic series; and similarly with the Armenians, and any other denominations. What happens? Months before the Mission opens, publicity in Greek, Arabic, English, French, Armenian, begins to arouse interest in it. United intercession services are held. Men pray, seriously, vitally, and definitely for conversion of members of other Churches and races in their own city—that alone is an act of enormous health-giving and vitalizing power. A host of laymen and laywomen are enlisted to visit every Christian home: there is also much mutual counsel as to what vital religious messages the people of the city and Church most

[1] The Rev. Maurice Richmond, of Cairo.

need. The Mission opens: all the papers in the town gives it space. Men who were never even respectful of sectarian religions are roused to serious interest and attend. The seal of God's approval is seen in lives brought back to God; God is in the movement, for the Church is here doing its primal and essential duty."

To return to local possibilities here in the homeland. I sometimes dream dreams of some town or locality making a great adventure in local unity and giving a signal lead to the whole Church. In my ideal town all the clergy and ministers would work together as a band of brothers, knit into one by mutual understanding and the consciousness of a common purpose. Their congregations would share this sense of all belonging to the same family life, and would express it by joint gatherings for prayer and conference, by occasional congregational visits to the different Churches for purposes of worship, and in other ways. By carefully arranged exchanges of sermons and lectures the spiritual treasures of each denomination would gradually become available for the good of all. Evangelistic work would be co-ordinated and co-operative. Sunday Schools, Young People's Guilds and Societies, Men's Clubs, and so on, would all retain their own special characteristics and their own denominational direction, but they would cease to be isolated or competitive; overlapping would be eliminated, and the secrets of success discovered in any one school or club would, through a central clearing-house of information, be made available for all. And, with all the Churches in such closely knit unity, their joint witness for social righteous-

ness and their joint efforts for all social betterment would be far more powerful throughout the whole community. If the Christians in any one place were really to find themselves thus linked together in a common devotion to Christ and standing shoulder to shoulder in labour for His cause, I cannot but think that, as time went on, they would find it intolerable to be for ever debarred from partaking together of the Sacrament of Fellowship, and intolerable to remain in completely separated organizations. The soul of unity would be present, and it would seek—would demand—a body; the exhilarating experience of a deep spiritual oneness would require for its satisfying expression a single living organism. And if this demand for One Church, coming thus *from below*, were to become widespread—a demand due not to a sense that a United Church is theoretically right but to an unassailable conviction that Christians simply cannot manage without it, indeed that *Christ* cannot manage without it—then assuredly the machinery at the top would begin to move; the necessary negotiations for schemes of Union, the regularizations and the authorizations, would be forthcoming all right if the great body of the Church, under sheer pressure of spiritual necessity, were to force the whole question into the immediate field of practical politics.[1]

Dreams, are they, and "mere" visions? Yet visions are necessary precursors of, in that they

[1] For an outline scheme of Reunion which would regularize just such possibilities as I have sketched, see a joint Memorandum by the Bishop of Truro and Dr Garvie, published in *The Church of England and the Free Churches*, by Bell & Robertson.

provide the strongest dynamic for, action. Perhaps the Church, these many centuries, has been sluggish in attempts to achieve Unity because it has been so slow to *see* what Christ meant, what the world needs, and what the Church might be. " Lausanne " led some of us once more to see visions and to dream dreams. And if all that happened there can help the Church, East and West, North and South, to embark anew on that courageous, adventurous, reckless path of self-forgetting love and inclusive fellowship where Christ leads the way, then that great Conference will not have been held in vain.

EPILOGUE

Concluding Statement
Drafted by the Chairman of the Conference at its Request

We have finished our immediate task. From first to last we are able to express it in constructive terms, written and received, whether they be statements of agreement or statements of difference, in brotherly love and mutual consideration. They are the product of the minds of men who earnestly desired and strove to place and keep themselves under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit. Human imperfections which mingle with them we pray God to pardon. In offering to Him our handiwork, we are but returning to Him that which He has given to us. We pray His acceptance of and blessing upon our offering.

However we have not finished our whole task. We have but taken a step on a long journey. The Conference was only a new starting-point. What we did there will crumble into dust unless the representatives at Lausanne bring home to their several Churches the duty and responsibility of studying the reports which they themselves received for this very purpose. The Conference should be repeated in every main ecclesiastical assembly, as well as in each separate congregation, throughout our entire Christian constituency, if

we are to take full advantage of the progress registered. By our presence and activity at Lausanne we are solemnly pledged to reproduce, each in his own local circle, the spirit and method which made the World Conference on Faith and Order what it was. "I pray you to give me the utter joy of knowing you are living in harmony, with the same feelings of love, with one heart and soul, never acting for private ends or from vanity, but humbly considering each other the better man, and each with an eye to the interests of others as well as to his own. Treat one another with the same spirit as you experience in Christ Jesus."[1]

We who have been privileged to labour together have done so in the joyousness of unhampered freedom. We must not forget, in the liberty which is to us a commonplace, the sufferings which some of our Christian brethren are at this very moment undergoing. Deprived of liberty, in hostile surroundings, their cry goes up to God from the house of their martyrdom. Our prayers enfold them and our sympathy stretches out affectionate arms toward them.

Finally, we commend the Christian Churches, whether represented in the Conference or not, to our Heavenly Father's guidance and safe-keeping, looking earnestly toward the day when the full mind of God will control all the affairs of mankind.

[1] Phil. ii. 2-5, Moffatt's translation.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF CHURCHES REPRESENTED AT LAUSANNE

Most of the Churches listed below were represented by delegates officially appointed. In some cases the representatives were credentialled as friendly visitors, and in the case of the German Churches they were selected by a committee formed for that purpose. A few Churches, members of which were present *ex officio* or by co-option, are not listed.

Anglican

Church of England.
Church of Ireland.
Episcopal Church in Scotland.
The Church in Wales.
Protestant Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.
Church of England in Canada.
Province of the West Indies.
Diocese in Argentina and Eastern South America.
Church of England in India.
Chung Hua Sheng Kung Hui (China).
Nippon Sei Kokwai (Japan).
Church of the Province of South Africa.
Church of England in Australia and Tasmania.

Baptist

Northern Baptist Convention, U.S.A.
Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, U.S.A.
Baptist Union of Ontario and Quebec.
Seventh Day Baptist Churches of Holland.
Baptist Churches in Germany.

Brethren

Church of the Brethren, U.S.A.

Christian

General Convention of the Christian Church, U.S.A.
Churches of Christ in North America.

Congregational

Congregational Union of England and Wales.
National Council of Congregational Churches in the United States.
North China Kung Li Hui.
Congregational Union of South Africa.
Congregational Union of Australia and New Zealand.

Disciples

Disciples of Christ in North America.
Churches of Christ in Great Britain.
Churches of Christ in Australia.

Eastern Churches

Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople.
Patriarchate of Alexandria.
Patriarchate of Jerusalem.
Church of Greece.
Church of Cyprus.
Church of Rumania.
Church of Serbia.
Church of Bulgaria.
Church of Russia.
Orthodox Church of Poland.
Church of Georgia.
Armenian Church.
Syrian Patriarchate of Antioch.

Evangelical Churches of Germany

Evangelical Church of the Old Prussian Union.
Evangelical Church of Baden.
Evangelical Church of Frankfort.
Evangelical Church of Hanover.
Evangelical Church of Hesse.
Evangelical Church of Thuringia.
Evangelical Church of Wurtemberg.

Friends

Society of Friends in Great Britain and Ireland.
Society of Friends in America.

Lutheran

United Lutheran Church in America.
Lutheran Free Church of America.
Norwegian Lutheran Church of America.
Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bavaria.
Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hanover.
Evangelical Lutheran Church of France.
Church of the Confession of Augsbourg (Alsace and Lorraine).
Church of Denmark.
Church of Norway.
Church of Sweden.
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hungary.
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Latvia.
Evangelical Lutheran Church in Slovakia.
Tamil Evangelical Lutheran Church (India).

Mennonites

Conference of South German Mennonites.

Methodist

Wesleyan Methodist Conference.
United Methodist Church.

Primitive Methodist Church.
Methodist Church in Ireland.
Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.
Methodist Episcopal Church, South, U.S.A.
Methodist Protestant Church in the United States.
African Methodist Episcopal Church, U.S.A.
Primitive Methodist Church, U.S.A.
Evangelical Methodist Church of France.
Wesleyan Methodist Church of South Africa.
Methodist Church of Australasia.

Moravian

Moravian Church in Germany.

Old Catholic Churches

Old Catholic Church in the Netherlands.
Old Catholic Church in Switzerland.

Presbyterian and Reformed

Church of Scotland.
United Free Church of Scotland.
Presbyterian Church of England.
Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
Presbyterian Church in Wales.
Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.
Presbyterian Church in the United States.
United Presbyterian Church of North America.
Reformed Church in the United States.
Reformed Church in America.
Presbyterian Church in Canada.
Reformed Churches of Switzerland.
National Union of the Reformed Evangelical Churches of France.
National Union of the Reformed Churches of France.
Reformed Church of Alsace and of Lorraine.
Reformed Church of Hungary.

Evangelical Church of Bohemian Brethren in Czecho-Slovakia.
German Evangelical Church in Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia.
Italian Evangelical Church.
Waldensian Evangelical Church.
Belgian Christian Missionary Church.
Presbyterian Church of New Zealand.

OTHER CHURCHES

Czechoslovak Church.
Protestant Churches of Portugal.
United Church of Canada.
South India United Church.
United Church of Northern India.

APPENDIX B

THE CONTINUATION COMMITTEE APPOINTED AT LAUSANNE

* Corresponding members.

Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D.D., *Chairman.*
Rev. Alfred E. Garvie, D.D., *Vice-Chairman.*
George Zabriskie, D.C.L., *Treasurer.*
Ralph W. Brown, *General Secretary*, P.O. Box 226, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.
Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D.
Dr Hamilcar Alivisatos.
Rev. Prof. Nicholas Arseniew.
Rev. Robert A. Ashworth, D.D.
Rev. Henry A. Atkinson, D.D.
Rev. Robert Bagnell, D.D.
*Rev. Harold N. Baker, M.A., alternate for Bishop White.
Rt. Rev. Mgr. K. Balakian, D.D.
Most Rev. Metropolitan Balan.
*Rev. John J. Banninga, D.D.

Rev. Clarence A. Barbour, D.D.
G. F. Barbour, D.Phil.
Rev. Canon H. N. Bate, M.A.
President Miner Lee Bates, LL.D.
Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Bombay.
*Rev. Ahva J. C. Bond, D.D.
*Rev. Erasmo Braga, D.D.
Rev. G. A. Brandelle, D.D.
Prof. Yngve Torgny Brilioth, D.Phil.
Rev. William Adams Brown, D.D.
Very Rev. Dr Sergius Bulgakow.
Rev. Bishop James Cannon, Jr., D.D.
Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury.
Rev. Samuel H. Chester, D.D.
Prof. Eugène Choisy, D.D.
*His Holiness the Metropolitan Chrysostom.
Judge Alexis de Boér, LL.D.
Prof. Dr. Adolf Deissmann.
Gen. Sup. D.Dr. Otto Dibelius.
*Most Rev. the Metropolitan of Warsaw and all Poland, Dionisy.
*Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Dornakal.
Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin.
Prof. Dr. Werner Elert.
Miss Lucy Gardner.
Most Rev. Metropolitan Germanos.
Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester.
President William Allen Harper, LL.D.
Rev. Bishop William H. Heard, D.D.
Prof. Friedrich Heiler, D.theol.
Prof. D.Dr Hermelink.
Rt. Rev. Peter Hognestad, D.D.
*Rev. Albert T. Holden, C.B.E., B.A.
Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Honduras.
Rt. Rev. Iriney, Bishop of Novi Sad.
Prof. James A. James, Ph.D., LL.D.
Rt. Rev. Bishop Paul Th. Jensen, D.D.
Freiherr Albert v. Kaas, Dr., alternate for Bishop v. Raffay.

Rev. Adolf Keller, D.D.
Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick.
Bischof D. Kortheuer.
Bishop Dr. Adolf Küry.
Dr. theol. August Lang.
Rev. Aleksi Lehtonen, D.D.
Prof. Geza Lencz, alternate for Judge de Boér.
*Rev. Timothy Tingfang Lew, Ph.D.
Rev. Janos Lindskog, D.D.
Rev. William F. Lofthouse, D.D.
Sir Henry Lunn, M.D.
President John H. MacCracken, LL.D.
Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D.D.
Rev. Bishop Francis J. McConnell, D.D.
Rev. Charles Merle d'Aubigné, D.D.
Rev. A. E. Monahan, M.A.
Rev. Wilfred Monod, D.D.
Rt. Rev. the Bishop of Montreal.
Rev. Bishop John M. Moore, D.D.
Rev. T. Albert Moore, D.D.
*Rt. Rev. James Okey Nash, D.D.
Rev. Bishop John Nuelsen, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Harald Ostenfeld, D.D.
Rev. Albert W. Palmer, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Edward L. Parsons, D.D.
*K. T. Paul, B.A.
Rt. Rev. James De Wolf Perry, D.D.
Bishop Alexander v. Raffay, D.D.
Rev. George W. Richards, D.D.
Rev. J. E. Roberts, D.D.
Mrs Kingman Mott Robins.
Hon. Lord Sands, LL.D.
Rev. M. G. G. Scherer, D.D.
Dr D. Prälat Schoell.
Prof. Friedrich Siegmund-Schultze, D.D.
Rev. P. Carnegie Simpson, D.D.
*Rev. William B. Smiley, D.D.
Rev. Edmund D. Soper, D.D.
Rt. Rev. Rotislav Stejskal, Th.D.

Rev. J. Ross Stevenson, D.D.
Rev. J. Sinclair Stevenson, M.A.
Rev. Canon Tissington Tatlow, D.D.
Pastor Niels B. Thvedt, B.D., alternate for Bishop Hognestad.
Rev. Floyd W. Tomkins, Jr., alternate for Bishop Brent.
Rt. Rev. Leon Tourian, D.D.
*Rt. Rev. Gilbert White, D.D.
Rev. F. Luke Wiseman, M.A.
Rev. Canon Edward S. Woods, M.A.
*Rev. David Z. T. Yui, Litt.D.
Prof. Dr Stefan Zankow.
Prof. Dr Francis Zilka.
Rt. Rev. Samuel Zoch, D.D.
*Rev. Samuel M. Zwemer, D.D.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

280.11
W894

Woods, Edward Sydney

AUTHOR

Lausanne 1927.

TITLE

280.11
W894 Woods, Edward Sydney
Lausanne 1927.

59159